

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE

CONFLICTING CONVERSATIONAL STYLES
IN A CROSS-CULTURAL BUSINESS NEGOTIATION

por
PEDRO DE MORAES GARCEZ

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
para obtenção do grau de MESTRE EM LETRAS

FLORIANÓPOLIS
Agosto de 1991

Esta dissertação foi julgada adequada e aprovada em sua forma final pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Inglês para a obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Opção Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

Bernadete Pasold

Bernadete Pasold

COORDENADORA

Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard

Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard

ORIENTADORA

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard

Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard

José Luiz Meurer

José Luiz Meurer

Branca Telles Ribeiro

Branca Telles Ribeiro

Florianópolis, 12 de agosto de 1991.

I dedicate this dissertation to Claudia,
for her enduring support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank a number of people who have helped me in one way or another in this project. Among them, special thanks goes to: Mrs. Yvonne Dreux, as a representative of the Brazilian-American Binational Center in Porto Alegre, for their confidence in my professional competence; the participants in the recorded event, especially the Brazilian manufacturer whom I have called Roberto, for having trusted my discretion; my relatives, for having provided both the logistic support during the recordings and the necessary encouragement during research. Finally, I would also like to thank Branca Telles Ribeiro, for having provided the sound theoretical guidelines and the friendly encouragement to the development of my ideas, and Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard for having trusted and encouraged me to write this dissertation in such a short period of time.

July 15, 1991.

CONFLICTING CONVERSATIONAL STYLES IN A CROSS-CULTURAL BUSINESS
NEGOTIATION

PEDRO DE MORAES GARCEZ

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
1991

Supervising Professor: Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard
Associate Supervising Professor: Branca Telles Ribeiro

ABSTRACT

Import-export business meetings between two American importers and two Brazilian manufacturers were video-recorded during four consecutive days. Research data was then integrated for the identification of the uncomfortable moments in the interaction through an ethnographic microanalysis of the interaction (Erickson 1991). Three speech activities are identified through a succinct frame analysis: technical specifications talk, small talk, and negotiation talk. The uncomfortable moments in the performance of arguing tasks in the negotiation activity are analyzed according to an interactional sociolinguistic approach (Gumperz 1982a). Two different point-making styles are revealed: while the American importers were found to state their points and then support them, the Brazilian manufacturers were found to make their points by providing extensive background information as support prior to stating them. Four different types of miscommunication of intent are presented. They were found to result from the participants' unshared contextualization conventions for the production and interpretation of point-making. The work concludes that the participants' unintentional use of different conversational styles caused serious miscommunication, and suggests that this can be avoided if language teaching (TESOL especially) sensitizes learners to sociolinguistic diversity in discourse organization.

ESTILOS CONVERSACIONAIS CONFLITANTES EM UMA NEGOCIAÇÃO
TRANSCULTURAL

PEDRO DE MORAES GARCEZ

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
1991

Professor Orientador: Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard
Professor Co-Orientador: Branca Telles Ribeiro

RESUMO

Durante quatro dias consecutivos, foram gravadas em vídeo reuniões entre dois importadores norte-americanos e dois fabricantes brasileiros. Apresenta-se aqui a microanálise etnográfica desta interação (Erickson 1991). A partir desta análise foram integrados os dados de pesquisa e isolados os momentos de conflito na interação. Através de sucinta análise de quadros (Tannen 1984, 1986), identificam-se nestes dados três atividades de fala: especificações técnicas, conversa social e negociação. Com base na abordagem sociolinguística interacional, analisam-se a seguir os momentos de conflito na execução de tarefas argumentativas que ocorreram durante a atividade de negociação (Gumperz 1982a). Esta análise revela dois estilos diferentes para o estabelecimento dos pontos de argumentação: observou-se que, enquanto os importadores norte-americanos apresentavam seus pontos para em seguida defendê-los, os fabricantes brasileiros faziam uma série de observações preliminares em defesa de seus pontos antes de apresentá-los. Apresentam-se então quatro problemas de má comunicação gerados por conflitos entre estes estilos. Observou-se que esses conflitos resultaram do fato dos participantes não compartilharem das mesmas convenções de contextualização para produzir e interpretar enunciados como pontos de argumentação. Conclui-se que o uso inadvertido de estilos conversacionais diferentes por parte dos participantes causou os graves problemas de comunicação apresentados. Sugere-se ainda que este tipo de problema pode vir a ser evitado caso o ensino de língua (inglesa para falantes de outras línguas, em especial) conscientize os alunos da existência de diversidade sociolinguística na organização do discurso.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Resumo	vi
Table of Contents	vii
Key to Transcription Conventions	ix
 Chapter 1 Introduction	 1
1.1 Purposes of Analysis	5
1.2 Organization of This Dissertation	8
 Chapter 2 Microethnographic Description of a Cross-Cultural Business Interaction	 10
2.1 The Field of Data Collection	11
2.1.1 The macro context	11
2.1.2 A preliminary fieldwork	13
2.1.3 The participants	15
2.1.4 The location	20
2.1.5 The Courofatos-Amage association	20
2.1.6 The background to this meeting	22
2.2 The Process of Negotiating Entry	22
2.2.1 The recording	23
2.3 The Encounters	25
2.4 The Work on the Primary Data Source	32
2.4.1 The transcription conventions	34
 Chapter 3 Three Activities in the Event - What Participants Do Through Talk	 37
3.1 The Framing of Speech Activities	37
3.2 The Three Macro Frames in the Business Interaction	41
3.2.1 Technical specifications talk	42
3.2.2 Small talk	45
3.2.3 Negotiation talk	47
 Chapter 4 Conversational Styles in Cross-Cultural Business Negotiation	 53
4.1 Negotiation	53
4.1.1 Genre	54
4.1.2 Participation structure in negotiation talk	55
4.1.3 Topical coherence in negotiation talk	57

4.2	Conversational Style in Cross-Cultural Communication ...	59
4.2.1	Conversational style	59
4.2.2	Cross-cultural communication	61
4.3	Analysis of Conversational Styles in the Cross-Cultural Business Negotiation at Courofatos	62
Chapter 5	Two Styles of Making a Point in Negotiation	66
5.1	Point and Point-Making	66
5.2	Two Ways of Organizing Point and Support	70
5.2.1	Point-making importer style	70
5.2.2	Point-making exporter style	73
5.3	Is it Always Like That?	75
5.3.1	When the Brazilian uses "the American style"	76
5.3.2	When the American uses "the Brazilian style"	81
5.4	Are These Point-Making Styles American and Brazilian? ..	85
Chapter 6	Communication Problems Due to Different Point-Making Styles	87
6.1	Expectations of What a Point Must Be Like	88
6.2	Four Problems of Communication Due to Conflicting Styles	91
6.2.1	"Oh, you're talking about that. Right?" - The American elicitation of the Brazilian point	91
6.2.2	"You never explained that." - Intent not communicated ..	99
6.2.3	"Do me a favor: get to the point!" - Interrupted point-making results in poorly supported arguing	110
6.2.4	"Do you think I am being dishonest?" - Intent misunderstood	127
Chapter 7	Concluding Remarks and Implications	134
7.1	Remarks About Power Control Mechanisms in the Negotiation at Courofatos	136
7.2	Implications of This Research to ELT	142
Appendix	146
References	160

KEY TO TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

- .. indicates pause of less than 1/2 second
- ... indicates pause longer than 1/2 second and shorter than 1 second
- indicates pause of 1 second
- (1.5) indicates pause longer than 1 second
- . indicates falling intonation
- ˆ indicates rising intonation
- ˆ indicates subtle rising intonation (more will follow)
- ˆ indicates higher pitch until next punctuation
- ˆ indicates lower pitch until next punctuation
- indicates sudden break in speech
- : indicates elongation of vowel sound
- but standard ok - indicates stress
- CAPS indicate extra-strong stress
- /words/ indicate quiet voice
- ↑ indicates loud voice until next punctuation
- () indicate unintelligible words
- (words) indicate uncertain transcription
- = indicates talk continues without interruption
- [brackets linking two lines show overlap
-] reverse-flap brackets show latching
- (laughs) below utterance indicate non-verbal behavior
- (acc) or (dec) above utterance indicate accelerated or decelerated pace in speech until next punctuation

adapted from Tannen & Wallat 1987:215.

Chapter 1

Introduction

S12.EG1.L013-5.

- 013 R we always uh you know, what we're trying to do is we're=
014 =trying to show it... you know,=
015 C =they're trying to show us everything.

The short excerpt above shows an uncomfortable moment in a business interaction. Miscommunication due to different styles of arguing is the cause of the problem. The exchange is a glimpse of the main thrust of this study: different conventions for the production and interpretation of messages in everyday life may lead to unintentional miscommunication.

Roberto and Charles are two business negotiators whose cultural conventions were acquired in their early years in quite diverse backgrounds. Now they must sit and strike a business deal that is convenient for all concerned. The problem is that they are unaware that different cultural conventions may get in the way of an otherwise smooth interaction, as in the exchange above. While Roberto tried to explain that he and his partner were behaving appropriately according to their convention (that is, giving background information before disclosing their point), Charles was reacting to it based on his own convention, according to which such behavior is non-standard.

In modern urban societies, it is now common for people from very different backgrounds to come into contact with one another in a number of situations. These different people have to establish and maintain communicative involvement by engaging in face-to-face interaction. In these face-to-face encounters,

participants may share a language, a common code used very similarly in terms of phonology and grammar. Eventual differences in the use of the code as such can be easily perceived as linguistic errors. However, the same participants may not share the conventions for the production and interpretation of discourse when using that code. Therefore, in these cross-cultural interactions, the patterns of communicative behavior learned through interaction at home and in the native community may no longer serve as the underlying maxims for organizing their relationship with other individuals. Moreover, the eventual differences among participants in the production of discourse due to their unshared conventions will not usually be perceived as errors, but as social faux pas (Gumperz 1982a:132). Therefore, the same conventions that are taken for granted in the interaction with people who share the same background may cause problems in the interaction with people from different backgrounds if they are not adapted to the cross-cultural context.

The present work applies Gumperz' interactional sociolinguistic approach in an analysis of the point-making styles of two American importers and two Brazilian manufacturers involved in a business negotiation. This research examines a naturally occurring interaction when people from different background must talk, and must adapt to one another's discourse conventions, a process that is some times quite strenuous and uncomfortable for the participants.

The data used in this study are of a naturally occurring type. The business negotiation I recorded took place in the office of a company I am calling Courofatos.

This interaction exhibited many situations of persuasion where communication breakdowns were not at all uncommon. As Gumperz (1982a:210) puts it:

Economic factors, differences in goals and aspirations, as well as other historical and cultural issues may be at issue. But we have reasons to suspect that a number of breakdowns may be due to inferences based on undetected differences in contextualization strategies, which are after all the symbolic tip of the iceberg reflecting the forces of history. The existence of communicative differences must be of course demonstrated.

To demonstrate these communicative differences, I chose to look at a feature of conversational style: the organizational pattern of point-making. Most of the breakdowns in the negotiation tended to occur in the performance of arguing tasks. This indicated that the American and the Brazilian parties seemed to have conversational problems in producing and interpreting each other's points of argument.

Two remarks in Gumperz (1982a) were influential in this choice. First, he says that 'it is at the level of perceiving and categorizing interutterance or interturn relationships that interpretation is most sensitive to differences in social background' (p.37). Second, he says that, 'to follow the thematic progression of an argument and to make one's contribution relevant, one must be able to recognize culturally possible lines of reasoning ...' (p.160).

The theoretical stance I take here sees language as a necessary means of communication among individuals within social reality. The reasons for studying conversational style stem from this view. The more immediate interest in the study of conversational style is thus to look at the social aspect of this picture, in search of how the styles of different social or ethnic

groups differ. The more important interest is, however, to study human communication, and 'communication cannot be studied in isolation: it must be analyzed in terms of its effects on people's lives. We must focus on what communication does: how it constrains evaluations and decision making, not merely how it is structured' (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982a:1). Thus in this work I follow the ethnographic and discourse research tradition of Hymes, Gumperz, Erickson and Tannen.

Gumperz (1982a) says that the way individuals strategically pattern their speech is an indexical sign in itself, entering into the composition of social reality.

Detailed observation of verbal strategies revealed that an individual's choice of speech style has symbolic value and interpretive consequences that cannot be explained simply by correlating the incidence of linguistic variants with independently determined social and contextual categories. (p.vii)

In other words, the ways individuals perform the discourse tasks that will ultimately carry out their everyday wants are not universal, but culture-specific conventions that are set through the course of history and learned by each individual through interaction. Gumperz (1982a) calls these signs contextualization conventions or cues.

The notion of contextualization conventions is basic to the analysis of verbal interaction within an interpretive sociolinguistic approach. It sensitizes us to observe patterns of cultural presuppositions, and helps us understand how such presuppositions are formatted and eventually interpreted in face-to-face communication.

The analysis to follow here will demonstrate that the participants were indeed using different contextualization

conventions, an unconscious practice evolving into communication breakdowns, miscommunication, and contributing to the formation of ethnic stereotyping.

Miscommunication caused by contextualization conventions reflects phenomena that are typically sociolinguistic, in the sense that their interpretive weight is much greater than their linguistic import as measured by the usual techniques of contrastive grammar.

(Gumperz 1982a:150)

An ethical remark about the data is in order: I would like to stress herethat all names referring to the participants in the recorded event have been changed to avoid their identification, and thus to protect their privacy.

1.1 Purposes of Analysis

There are two main practical purposes of this analysis. The first is to point out strategic differences in the performance of a discourse task (arguing in negotiation) by speakers of Brazilian and American background. The second is to show how these different discourse strategies may enter into conflicting interpretations of the same message by speakers of these backgrounds, who take those messages as unambiguous.

The aim is not to come up with the ultimate meaning of messages. It is rather to identify interpretive conventions that may be causing unintended miscommunication, and may be interfering with the quality of the interaction between otherwise affable and cooperative people.

The study also aims at producing a microethnographic report of a typical event in which participants are very likely to miscommunicate due to the different contextualization conventions entailed from their vastly different ethnic backgrounds.

The following chapters present the microethnographic analysis of the negotiation event according to the tenets set by Erickson (1988, 1991) in his analytical approach to the study of educational interaction. According to Erickson (1988:1082),

... ethnography ... proceeds by direct observation of concrete situations. It places at the center of research interest naturally occurring speech, considered as a mode of social activity that is situated in a total community or society as well as the immediate scene of local social life in which the speech itself occurred.

The means of this approach are initial participant observation and, in addition, the analysis of audiovisual documents. By having the footage of the interaction available, 'the researcher revisits a particular set of instances through replaying the tape or film' (Erickson 1991:12), without having to wait for its recurrence.

The specific aims of such microanalysis include the general ethnographic 'aim of specifying and describing those local processes that produce outcomes' (Erickson 1991:4). In this study, this means looking at arguing processes that produce negotiation outcomes, or, at another level, looking at inferential processes that produce felicitous or infelicitous interpretive outcomes. In addition, its purposes are also, among others, to document those processes in more detail and precision than usual participant observation would allow in order to understand the organization of routine processes of interaction, describing how (in addition to just what) interaction takes place.

Thus this rich analytical approach provides the present work with research guidelines for the study of conversational styles. In addition, it allows the present work to yield a microethnographic report of cross-cultural negotiation involving

Americans and Brazilians. As Erickson (1991:7) himself summarizes,

... ethnographic interest in combining levels or aspects of social organization, describing broad patterns that characterize institutions and communities and focusing narrowly and precisely on the particular communicative actions of specific individuals, leads the researcher to attend not only to information that is available "on the screen" but to information that comes from beyond the screen, from wider participant observation and from social research more generally.

Thus ultimately, the goal of the present work is to look at the whole and the parts of discourse, which are indeed inseparable. In her review about studies in conversational sequence, Piazza (1987:328) writes about an impasse in linguistic studies - that in trying to interpret and classify units of discourse in conversation, they miss the holistic perspective of conversation. As far as interactional sociolinguistics is concerned, this impasse seems to be largely resolved.

The following analysis of conversational styles in a cross-cultural business negotiation intends to belong to Interactional Sociolinguistics. It is also an aim of this study to qualify to belong to the description of this research tradition given by Wolfson (1989:141) as follows:

Making use of videotapes to capture a tremendous richness of interactional detail, researchers in this area employ microethnography in rigorous and elegant analyses of encounters between interlocutors. Given the recognition that it is now commonplace in modern industrialized societies for individuals from quite different sociocultural backgrounds to have the occasion and even the necessity to interact, and that these interactions are often fraught with tension, if not outright hostility, the aim of interactional sociolinguistics is to isolate differences in behavioral patterns which lead to miscommunication.

1.2 Organization of This Dissertation

Chapter 2 presents the microethnographic description of the cross-cultural business interaction on which this work is based. Initially I introduce the general context in which the interaction occurred by discussing how I approached the field, and by describing the participants, the physical surroundings, and so on. Then I report how permission was granted to enter the field, how the data were recorded, and what happened during the business interaction. The chapter closes with the discussion on how I went about transforming field notes and audiovisual recordings into final research data.

Chapter 3 presents the three speech activities that are most salient during the event. First, I discuss some theoretical concepts to identify the three activities: technical specifications talk, small talk, and negotiation talk. The analysis thereon will concentrate on the negotiation activity.

Chapter 4 establishes the theoretical foundation to my analysis of conversational style in the cross-cultural business event. First, I discuss the concept of negotiation as a genre of talk, with special emphasis on its peculiarities as far as participation structure and topical coherence are concerned. Second, I discuss the concepts of conversational style and cross-cultural communication. Finally, I discuss the analysis of conversational styles in the negotiation interaction.

After I define what I mean by the terms point and point-making in chapter 5, I analyze a number of transcribed segments of the negotiation. The two styles of point-making are presented, exemplified and discussed. Then I present a few

segments from the interaction when the two negotiation parties seemed to invert their stylistic strategies. Though these examples apparently contradict the existence of two different contextualization conventions in point-making, their contextual analysis shows that the inversion is consistent with their respective conventions. As a closing to this chapter, I discuss the extent to which the styles can be claimed to apply to other individuals and interactions.

The problems of communication caused by the clashes between the two point-making styles are presented in chapter 6. After I discuss the role of stylistic expectations in discourse interpretation, I introduce and discuss examples of four types of miscommunication of intent in the negotiation.

The concluding chapter wraps up this work. First I debate the relevance of an eventual analysis of the power control mechanisms at play in the business interaction. This is followed by suggestions for further research and by a discussion on the implications of this research to English language teaching (ELT).

Chapter 2

Microethnographic Description of a Cross-Cultural Business Interaction

In this chapter I describe the ethnographic elements of this research. In order to answer a series of questions about the event from which my data on negotiation talk sprang, I want first to put these data in perspective, and show how they were collected and later organized. This will allow for a holistic comprehension of the findings to be derived from the data as far as cross-cultural conversational styles and the communication problems they entail are concerned.

Since 'ethnography is an ambiguous term, representing both a process and a product' (Agar 1980:1), this chapter describes how the ethnographic work in my research was carried out as well as what resulted of it.

The initial section introduces the region in which the business event took place. This will lead to a discussion of how common and important this sort of event is to the economy of this region. Next I will describe some of the relevant aspects concerning the ethnographic (as-process) part of my research - how participants were contacted, who they are, what the companies involved are like, what kind of partnership they have, what happened in their previous meeting, among other issues. In a second section I will describe how I actually entered the field and recorded the event. In a third section, I present a brief narrative of the factual development of the event so that a broad

perspective is given of how things moved from here to there in terms of the negotiation. Finally, the chapter closes with a discussion of the methodology used to transform the primary data source (the audiovisual recordings) into the final research data to be focused on.

2.1 The Field of Data Collection

2.1.1 The macro context

I wanted to look at cross-cultural communication involving Brazilian speakers of EFL in a business environment. I knew from hearsay that business events where Americans and Brazilians interacted happened almost daily in my native Vale do Sinos region. So I started searching for opportunities to participate in and observe such an event. Here I follow Gumperz' (1982a:165) definition of a speech event as one of those

units of verbal behavior bounded in time and space, ... vary[ing] in the degree to which they are isolable, ...[in which] all verbal behavior is governed by social norms specifying participant roles, rights and duties vis-a-vis each other, permissible topics, appropriate ways of speaking and ways of introducing information.

At that point I was particularly concerned with the kind of data I would be able to collect. My concern was to find data that were not only recordable, but also representative. By representative data in this case, I meant data that were not particularly rare or idiosyncratic in their nature: I wanted to try to come up with an analysis about the differing discourse strategies (Gumperz 1982a) used by Brazilian and American business negotiators which could be claimed to bear on other occurrences of the same event. This is not to say that I was not aware of the illusive character of such a drive or claim, for, as Johnstone

(1986:183) puts it,

the persuasive strategies people choose ..., and the effects of their choices, will depend on the person they are dealing with and the context. People adapt to one another, or they try and fail, but even the failures are the result of situated action.

The data were collected in October, 1990, at an industrial city in Rio Grande do Sul. This city is one of the major cities in the Vale do Sinos region within the metropolitan area of Porto Alegre. It is thus located within the main industrial center in Southern Brazil. Shoes and other leather products are the main items exported, and they make an important contribution to the total output of Brazilian foreign trade.

Many companies in the area hire executives whose activities more often than not include face-to-face contact with foreign buyers, mostly native speakers of English, which is exactly the case of Courofatos (the company where I recorded the negotiation event analyzed here).

According to Teruchkin (1990:628), 'the state of Rio Grande do Sul contributes with 80% of the number of pairs of shoes exported by the country.' Shoes and leather goods meant 27.22% of the state's total export output in 1988, a very significant figure in a state where the export/GNP ratio (17.35%) is almost twice as high the mean rate for the whole of the Brazilian economy (9.66%).

'The U.S. still absorbs around 75 to 80% of RS' [shoe and leather goods] exports...' (Teruchkin 1990:628). This means that most exporters in the Vale do Sinos region have business connections with the United States.

The interest in looking at this type of cross-cultural interaction stemmed from my contacts in the local industry. I knew

that it took these professional negotiators a number of years to acquire some competence in securing their companies', or even their own best interests, in spite of their training in fields such as Economics, Business Administration or Foreign Trade. This is understandable because of the complexity of the linguistic and interactional task in which they must engage, since, besides not being fluent EFL speakers in many cases, these Brazilian business negotiators usually find native speakers of the language of contact across the negotiation table. This only adds weight to their burden of keeping the interaction under control, since 'an asymmetrical power relationship exists between native and non-native speakers (whether the native speaker is conscious of it or not)' (Thomas 1983:106).

The Brazilians seem to still have the added handicap of lacking any metainteractional awareness of the difficult speech event they find themselves in, since many times their interlocutors are highly trained negotiators.

2.1.2 A preliminary field work

I contacted about ten different previously acquainted gatekeepers, that is, personal contacts that would ultimately open or close the gate to the field, in companies in the region so as to negotiate any entry. There were many problems to be faced, though.

Just as Agar (1980:59) had predicted, people kept seeing some sort of malevolent intent behind my request of entry. Agar's tentative explanation for why that happens seems to the point, for the ethnographer is, in fact, 'a complete stranger requesting the

status of an intimate, an insider.'

However, Agar also defines ethnography as 'really an arrogant enterprise' (p.4), and so I proceeded, trying to follow different social trails that would lead me to an open door.

Soon I found out that the main reason for the rejections was the fact that I had been looking for shoe export connections while still unaware of the fact that shoe-export negotiations are "too dirty" to be recorded or even witnessed by strangers. That was a clear indication, however, of how much is at stake during those meetings, and of how unknown they are to uninitiated outsiders.

After contacting a number of companies in industries other than shoes, the picture looked less dark. At last the chance to watch and record such an event was given to me by Roberto Madeira, the export manager of a leather-goods industry. Interestingly enough, he had given up his job in the shoe-export business before he started working for this company. Following Agar (1980), I was able to show this gatekeeper that he would be getting something in return for allowing me to study how negotiations occurred in his business. I had used the 'successful strategy' referred to by Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:10) of 'enlisting the cooperation of participants who have become convinced that they can gain insights into their ... processes.' He told me he had majored in Foreign Trade and that everything he knew about professional behavior in those meetings he had learned by himself.

The initial plan was to sit in during a number of encounters, and then record one. However, the opportunity to record an encounter came sooner than expected: there was going to be a meeting in two weeks to which I was invited. I decided to take up

this offer immediately.

This entire meeting resulted in a number of audio and video tapes totaling 17 hours of interaction. The four main participants and I spent an average of 8 hours a day for four days in a row. The following section describes the context of situation of that particular event.

2.1.3 The participants

Two participants compose the American party in the meetings: Harry Kaplan and Charles Bernstein. Both are Jewish American native speakers of American English. They live and work in the metropolitan area of New York City, and have no special contact with Brazilian, or Latin American culture, other than through their business connections.

Harry Kaplan is the chairman of the board of a large enterprise called Amage. He is about 50 years old and a true New Yorker. He was born, and has always lived in and around New York City. He has been doing business with Brazilians for about 10 years. His knowledge of Portuguese is minimal. His exposure to Latin American culture is as significant as his exposure to the cultures of the various other countries where his business interests take him, such as Romenia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Taiwan, China, Korea, India, Mexico. Harry speaks Hebrew and some Romenian.

Harry is an extrovert with strong opinions. He seemed to have a positive attitude towards Brazil and its people at large. However, in the informal private interviews with me, he was quite critical of the country, sometimes revealing a judgmental edge of

criticism based on stereotypes of the kind "Latin Americans are too relaxed=(lazy)," or "the problem with this country is their rotten ethics." In his view, Brazilians are the most difficult people to do business with. "They seem not to want to sell, to get a business done. They're not aggressive!" - he said.

Harry used to work in the wood import business before he took over Charles Bernstein's leather goods factory, and turned it into an import & merchandise business. He kept Charles as president of the company, though in fact Charles became his technical advisor.

Charles Bernstein is about 65 years old. He was born in Massachussets, as his accent "obviously shows," according to Harry, but has been living in the metropolitan area of NYC for very long. Charles is quiet, speaks softly, but proved to be quite good humored throughout the encounters. Like his partner, his exposure to foreign cultures has always been that of an accidental tourist. He says he has a "tin ear" for languages, so he knows that even when he tries to say "thank you" in Portuguese he may not be understood.

Charles is responsible mainly for the technical matters discussed in the encounters, such as ways to overcome production problems. His expertise comes from his more than 20 years of experience as a leather-goods manufacturer. Despite this fact, however, the last word even on technical matters is not his, but Harry's.

The two main participants on the Brazilian side of the court are Eduardo Amati, 33, and Roberto Madeira, 28. Both are native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese.

Eduardo Amati is the financial director of the company. He is

also the son of the president of the company. Eduardo is from the town where the factory is located, went to the local schools, and started studying Economics at the local university, but quit before graduating. He learned English in secondary school and during his six-month stay in Germany, where he shared a room with a Dutchman who spoke no German. His English is nearly fluent, despite the frequent grammar mistakes and his thick Brazilian Portuguese accent. Eduardo has a good sense of humor and seems to be well liked by everyone at Courofatos. Charles and Harry also seem to like him as a business associate.

Eduardo's brother also used to work for the company, but he left some time ago to work elsewhere. This puts Eduardo in a double bind: although he feels loyal to his family if he stands by his father in the company, he doubts that he is doing the best for himself. His views on the company differ in some respects from his father's. For example, Eduardo feels he can understand the position of the workers when they negotiate with him because he believes their position is similar to his when he has to negotiate with the American importers.

Roberto Madeira is the export manager at Courofatos. He has been working there for five years. Though originally from the state of Goiás, Roberto has been living in town since 1980 (ten years). He married locally, and graduated from the local university with a major in Foreign Trade. He learned English abroad when he spent six months in Ottawa, Canada, and six months in Rochester, NY. His command of the language is near-native, so he is quite comfortable using it. Roberto is friendly and very easy to talk to.

Roberto is aware of the "generation clash" within the company and tries to ease conflict wherever it arises. Concerning his American business associates, Roberto is very fond of both. He told me he has been learning a lot with them. He said their main problem of communication was that "Americans are very objective, and if you don't have quick solutions they quit talking."

These four participants are unanimous in saying that their personal relationship is optimal. They consider each other friends, and that could be seen in the way they interacted at different moments in the office and during the breaks. In these instances, they acted very informally: feet on tables, sleeping in the office, joking and playing tricks on each other, using swear words.

The fifth participant in the encounters was the researcher, Pedro Garcez, 25, born and raised locally.

Though I was practically a complete stranger to all other participants before I displayed my intention of studying their interaction, I was able to show each one of them that, for one reason or the other, we had some things in common. Having been a member of the local community, I immediately revealed to the Amatis that my network of relationships included some people in theirs. Since Roberto's in-laws knew me, I was able to show him I was trustworthy by meeting him in their place. Finally, I was able to claim some shared social features with the two Americans by telling them that I had lived for a whole year with a Jewish family in a Jewish community in a New York suburb close to where they lived.

The fact I had once had a job as an export-assistant in a

local industry also helped me to show the participants that, although I was not a peer, I was not a complete outsider either. Agar (1980:60) states that 'the ethnographer can make ... a difference if she is not completely new to the group. If she can behave in a way that indicates prior insider status elsewhere, it will change people's interpretation of her role.' This remark became especially relevant during one of the lunch breaks. By 'looking interested and suggesting a couple of turns toward the other side of the ballroom to check the view from there' (Agar 1980:90), I was able to recite a Hebrew prayer, and thus show my "Jewish" background to the importers. This produced a considerable change of attitude towards me from that moment on.

Soon all of the participants came to see me as somehow belonging in there for the time being. 'Eventually people come to accept you for what you are - a strange person who asks many dumb questions' (Agar 1980:60).

Of the many other people who occasionally took part in the interaction, only Flavio Amati, Eduardo's father and president of the company, is worth mentioning here. Flavio is around 60, and has been the president of this company for some 20 years now.

Flavio Amati's presence almost always played havoc with the other participants and the interaction. On the one hand both his son and his employee, Roberto, felt they had to explain what was going on, and consult him on the matter being decided everytime he came into the room. The Americans, on the other hand, especially Harry, seemed to worry that his presence might spoil what they had accomplished. At some point Harry said in a kidding tone that "Mr. Amati" should go jogging, that is, leave the room. Flavio Amati's

English is minimal, but his contributions were important for the realm of reverence in which they were involved.

2.1.4 The location

Courofatos is a medium-size industry with around 500 employees. The plant and the office are located within the urban area of the city. It manufactures various leather goods both for the domestic and the export markets on a 60/40% ratio. Besides the U.S., Courofatos also exports to Western Europe, Latin America, Australia and Japan. Mr. Amati owns 60% of the shares of the company.

2.1.5 The Courofatos-Amage association

What brings these parties together is their business interests. Since January, 1990, Amage - the American importing company - had been importing attache cases and portfolios from Courofatos. These products were then introduced in the American market under a special trademark in a completely different marketing and merchandising scheme from the other lines, stressing the source of the products, i.e. Brazil.

The first year of business was extremely profitable, but quantities were not very large, so now the importing company wanted to add a number of new items to the collection and increase quantities.

This was a problem for Courofatos. On the one hand, Roberto and Eduardo were concerned that this new bulk of orders on the new items might upset the balance between domestic and export production, which they felt had to remain as it was. They did not

want to allocate more than 50% of their capacity to a single exporter, Amage, and consequently become dependent on it. On the other hand, however, they had the clear interest to maintain their business association with Amage.

The main problem both parties had during these first 10 months of business (January-October 1990) was the need for Courofatos to increase prices. This was unacceptable for Amage, for they maintained that in the American market one cannot increase prices in the middle of a year. On the other hand Courofatos argued that they could not keep those prices due to the tremendous changes brought into the Brazilian economy by the new government that had taken office on March 15, 1990 (especially in terms of the exchange rates for foreign currencies).

It was only after a series of negotiation rounds, held at Amage's headquarters in New York around a month prior to the recorded encounter, that they were able to come to terms and agree on a 10% increase. That was the first time "in the history of" Harry "doing business" that anyone had ever gotten a midterm increase in prices from him.

The cooperation between the two parties goes beyond a mere buying-selling relationship. Because Amage is truly interested in the products manufactured at Courofatos, they have tried to create a number of "fringe benefits" for Courofatos. In addition to letting the Brazilian company use some of the advertising materials produced for the merchandising of the products in the States, Harry and Charles try to use their connections in other countries to help Courofatos, for instance, finding cheaper materials to buy in those countries. According to Harry, it is

important for them to have as good a relationship as possible with their suppliers, so they try to cooperate.

Over the course of these first 10 months of business, they met five times, alternating the location of the meetings between Brazil and the U.S..

2.1.6 The background to this meeting

The importers had selected seven samples of items they would like to add to the collection for the coming year. These samples had been originally produced and costed by a potential new supplier to Amage in Czechoslovakia. They were then sent in advance to be duplicated at Courofatos so that technical feasibility and costing could be estimated before the meetings. The prices quoted by the Czechoslovakians were going to be used by the American importers as their target prices in Brazil. And yet, they had to have the items made in Brazil, otherwise their Brazilian line would not be consistent.

However, the samples came in without a proper invoice, and a Brazilian customs authority in Porto Alegre did not want to release them. This delayed the duplication of the samples for two weeks, so that when the importers arrived at the office, there were no samples to be looked at, and no prices to be negotiated.

2.2 The Process of Negotiating Entry

The process of negotiating entry involves contacting the various parties who will be involved in and be affected by the research, explaining the purposes and procedures of the research to them, and gaining their consent either to be filmed, or ..., to allow others in their charge to be filmed. (Erickson and Jan 1982:44)

My contact with the Brazilian party had been made through Roberto two weeks prior to the first encounter. Despite the agreement by the Brazilian party to my attendance and recording the encounters, I was told I would also have to get permission from the American party upon their arrival. For this reason I joined Roberto when he went to the airport to pick up the two importers.

A letter of introduction from the graduate program at UFSC stating my purpose and a few questions were enough for the American importers to grant me permission to tape the event.

I assured them that all mentions that allowed personal identification would be changed. This was very much in keeping with Agar's (1980:55) reminder that 'people must be informed of your role - who are you and what do you want.' It also followed Erickson and Jan's instructions for microethnographic audiovisual recording according to which 'specific agreements to protect the interests of the parties involved need to be worked out in terms of the particulars of the setting' (p.44).

Confidentiality was thus offered and agreed upon as part of the larger issue that Erickson and Jan (1982:44) allude to, the one concerning 'the fundamental ethical requirement of the researcher to prevent harm to those being studied.'

2.2.1 The recording

The recording of the event was done with the use of a video camera and two audio recorders. I tried to follow Erickson's procedures for video recording of face to face interaction as closely as possible. However, a number of unexpected difficulties

arose.

First of all, a trial run of the equipment at the setting was not possible because Roberto decided to change the plans for picking up the importers at the airport. Instead of meeting him at the office and then leaving from there, which would allow me a couple of hours to install the camera, I was picked up earlier than arranged, and I didn't get to the office until late in the afternoon when the importers were already there, and therefore the event had already started.

During the first encounter (Wednesday, Oct. 17), the camera was not turned on. It was, instead, just left on a desk so that everyone could see it. This was done for two reasons. First, Erickson and Jan (1982:46) say that 'if you give people time to get used to the presence of equipment ..., the equipment will soon become part of the woodwork.' In addition to that, because I had not been able to do a trial run of the equipment, setting it on would interfere with the action, and my guideline strictly told researchers to 'sacrifice the technical matter rather than inconvenience the people you are filming' (p.47).

On the other hand, audio recording is far less obtrusive, so I used two very small recorders to start recording the event. The sessions following the first were recorded primarily on video tape, with supporting audio recording serving to fill in the gaps for unintended interruptions in video taping.

Here again Erickson and Jan (1982:43) provided the guidelines for recording:

The simplest shooting procedure is to set the camera for a wide angle shot and make a 'take' that begins slightly before and ends slightly after the event being documented. A variant of this is possible in which minimal camera editing occurs

(moving the camera, changing the angle and breadth of the shot) provided (1) that the camera is left on the entire time that the major phases or episodes of action occurred, and (2) that the shot was wide enough to include within the frame all the participants engaged in interaction in the event.

The above instructions were followed closely during the recording. The result of this is that the footage obtained does fit Erickson and Jan's main criterion for a tape to be used as a primary data source: 'that it contains as complete a record as possible of the continuous action as it occurs in real time' (p.43).

During the second day of recording, participants started making fewer and fewer side comments on the fact that there was a camera on (with its blinking red light facing them) in the room. At some point during this second day of business talks, they showed no sign of noticing any of my movements in the room. Once again Erickson and Jan (1982:46) had predicted well:

With experience your movements in operating the equipment become synchronized with the rhythms of ebb and flow in the action you are shooting. As that happens your movements as an operator no longer draw attention to yourself and the equipment. You have become part of the scene and its naturally occurring timing.

2.3 The Encounters

The event started as soon as the two American importers arrived at Courofatos on Wednesday, October 17, 5 p.m.. The first encounter lasted until 6:30. Eduardo was not present. Most of the action consisted of procedurals for the following days.

The next day, Thursday, October 18, the two American participants and Roberto were at the office at 7:45 a.m.. They talked about the various materials that Courofatos could import from Taiwan in order to reduce the cost of its products. Charles

and Roberto were the ones doing most of the talking, since this was basically technical. Harry kept insisting on the point that samples and prices had to be ready soon, or they would not have anything to do there.

In this recording there were many interruptions of various sorts: telephone calls, office people coming in and out, visits from outsiders who wanted either to talk to Roberto or to ask favors from Harry, tea and refreshments being served, etc.. On top of that, there were two trips to the model shop inside the production area of the company, where video recording was impossible.

Little was accomplished objectively in terms of final decisions about the materials to be eventually imported from Taiwan. The materials for import were analyzed, and they could get some idea of which would be worth importing, but there were no definitive conclusions. At 12:00 a.m. they interrupted talks, and we left for lunch at a nearby restaurant.

At 1:20 p.m. we were back at the office only for the visitors to be able to pick up their belongings. Since there was nothing on which to base any business talks (samples and prices), Harry and Charles decided to go to the hotel. They would only come back on the day after, when - after bitter complaints from Harry - samples were promised to be available.

The next encounter started at 7:40 a.m. on Friday, October 19. Eduardo joined the gathering at 8:10, but the samples were not yet ready.

As soon as the Brazilian party was complete, they moved to the domestic sales room, which was right next to the export

1



Since the first samples were not to be presented until 8:30 a.m., the two parties started talking about the possibility of Courofatos eventually importing some items from Romenia through Amage. This again was of little objective avail. They never reached any commitments, and once again Harry and Charles started complaining about the delay in the production of samples and prices. Roberto tried to explain the delay.

Finally at 9:20 a.m. the first samples arrived. The core of negotiations started. Three items were discussed until 10:00. The prices quoted by Courofatos were very high compared to Harry's target prices. Harry presented the prices quoted by his new Czechoslovakian suppliers on the same items. Courofatos would have to present prices similar to those to beat the competition from Czechoslovakia.

Again, there were innumerable interruptions of the same sort described above. Since the other six samples were still not ready, nor were prices, they talked about a few other side topics, such as a possible advancement from Amage for Courofatos to be able to buy leather and put it in inventory, the schedule for future shippings of the old line, and so on. Harry and Charles got more and more irritated and started tossing in comments such as "you can't grow in this country," and "they're trying to change the subject because they don't have the samples ready yet." At 12:00 a.m., talk broke up and we all left for lunch.

At 1:10 p.m. we were all back to the factory. Only at around 1:40, after a trip to the model shop, overseas phone calls, etc., did any business talk occur. Since new samples and prices had not been presented until then, at around 2:15 Harry and Charles rested their heads on the table and tried to take a nap. When Roberto came back into the room, Harry started joking around saying they should have some couches in the office, so Roberto and I brought in a couch to the export room. With blinds down and lights off in the room, Harry and Charles slept until 4:20 p.m., when some more samples were ready.

"Showtime!" says Roberto before a yawning audience.

The first item to be discussed was called 69528. It was a treasured item by the importers: a portfolio with nine different compartments. However, it was very similar to an existing style in the old collection. The difference was that the new one had five additional files. Harry and Charles thought this feature made a big difference, but Roberto and Eduardo thought it only meant useless complication for assembly. The price presented by Courofatos was 40% higher than Amage's target, and this would be the main focus of negotiation until they agreed on the deal.

The second item came in at 4:40 p.m.. At 5:00 all prices were reviewed for clarification. This was followed by a long intermission in talk because of external interferences. Later on they started again, talking about two items that had not yet been sampled and costed. At around 6:00 p.m. Roberto proposed that they concentrate only on those items that Harry and Charles should think were the most important ones.

The talks reached an uncomfortable moment when it seemed they could not agree on any item. All prices were 15% higher than the prices set by the Czechoslovakians, and one - the most fought over item - was 40% higher.

At this stage there were no further interruptions from outsiders. The factory and the office were empty. Conversation lasted until 7:45 p.m., when all of us went to the factory's cafeteria for a 'churrasco.'

Negotiations resumed at 11:37 p.m., and lasted until 12:40 a.m.. Harry asked the manufacturers what items they could accept based on his offer, but there was no definitive answer. Rather, they started talking about the two items that were especially

problematic, 69528 and 69536.

The items that were 15% higher were said to be OK by the importers, but the ones above that were said to have been calculated wrongly. Talk ended at 12:40 a.m., because it seemed as if they were getting to a dead end. The closing tone was very tense.

The next encounter started only six hours later at 7:30 a.m.. The end of this last encounter, also the end of the event, was set for 11:30 a.m. (Harry and Charles had to make the 12:30 p.m. flight to Rio, and then to Frankfurt, on their way to Czechoslovakia). Charles started the talks by asking for clarifications on things that were not clear to him from the night before, while Harry rested his head on the table.

These clarifications were important because they relieved the tension considerably. The manufacturers were finally able to make a few points they had not made until that moment. After this, Harry talked at length until the group started renegotiating the price of the trouble item.

The resolution of the problem began to take shape when Eduardo proposed that Amage buy a set number of items throughout the year, providing advance payment for Courofatos to buy leather and put it in inventory, paying a single price based on the average of the prices of all items discussed. Harry agreed that this was a fair proposal, but that he could not be restricted to a set number of items with no ground rules for orders that exceeded it. So he himself proposed a 5% increase for orders beyond that set number of items.

To this, the exporters responded by saying it was not enough.

They counterproposed that the percentage difference between the price they quoted and Amage's target price should work as specific ground rules for exceeding orders on each particular item. However, some items had a 30 to 40% difference, so Harry rejected that.

The exporters then suggested they use the average difference of prices among all items as the ground rules for all exceeding orders, but this was around 15%, which the importers still considered too high.

Finally, after some more arguing from both sides, Harry proposed specific added prices for each additional exceeding order on the selected items he thought Amage would sell well (exactly the two that were 30 to 40% higher than his target price). These prices were worked on until they had a deal, struck at around 10:00 a.m..

At this point the mood changed significantly. They laughed and joked around for a while. Each member paired and talked within the team for some time. Then they quickly negotiated the other four secondary items, and arranged for technical specifications on the agreed items, as well as for quantities.

At 11:35 a.m. on Saturday, October 20, the event was over. Roberto took the importers to the airport, and Eduardo took me home. They had reached a satisfactory outcome to these long stressful hours of talk.

Amage was able to include four new items to its Brazilian line at prices roughly 15% above their displayed targets, two items to beat up a competitor in another section of the market for 10% above its original target, in addition to two small items

bought for "too much," which had no displayed target prices.

Courofatos was able to sell the items at prices well below its first quotations, but within a controllable bulk of orders. The main concern with not jeopardizing the company's balance of domestic/export production at a 60/40% ratio was taken care of. The business connection was thus kept, and the safety boundaries were also secured.

The objective result of the talks in orders amounted to around 35,000 pieces, or US\$ 1,000,000.00 in this initial order.

2.4 The Work on the Primary Data Source

'Ethnographic research in sociolinguistics ... is labor intensive during data analysis as well as during data collection' (Erickson 1988:1089). So after the collection of these data in audio and video tapes, a much longer phase in the research started, since 'most of the analytic work ... is done after the field work is completed' (Erickson 1991:23).

Erickson (1991:23-28) discusses five stages in the transformation of the primary data source collected during fieldwork into final analytic data (ethnography as product):

Stage one: reviewing the whole event.

Stage two: identifying major constituent parts of the event.

Stage three: identifying aspects of organization within the major parts of the event.

Stage four: focus on action of individuals.

Stage five: comparative analysis of instances across research corpus.

These stages were followed in this research.

First the tapes were reviewed a number of times and compared to field notes until the major constituent parts of the event could be spotted.

Second, one of these 'major constituent parts of the event' - the speech activity of negotiation - was isolated to be the focus of further analysis. The major aspects of its organization were then checked against the bibliography on negotiation talk.

Third, after the data for analysis had been identified and its organization established, a further reviewing of the tapes along with a fresh reappraisal of fieldnotes was done in order to look closely at the actions of participants. The criterion for this selection was the inspection of uncomfortable moments that could reveal unshared discourse strategies suspected to exist between the two negotiation parties. This revealed a series of stylistic features that seemed to be used chiefly by one party or the other. The most pervasive of these, point-making, was then chosen as the main focus of the analysis.

Finally, I closely inspected some specific instances when these stylistic features surfaced in the event. At this stage some conclusions started to take shape.

This process is described in the following chapters, where the actual analysis of the data is reported. The analysis demonstrates that the two negotiating parties used different styles of point-making when arguing in favor of their business interests.

In a further stage these findings will be discussed bearing in mind the event as a whole. The different styles of point-making by the two parties will be discussed in terms of their effect upon the development of negotiation towards the outcome.

So in this type of analytic work '... one begins by considering whole events, continues by decomposing them into

smaller fragments analytically, and concludes by recomposing them into wholes' (Erickson 1991:23). The aims of this 'sociolinguistic microanalysis of machine recordings' are threefold according to Erickson (1988:1089):

(1) to provide a detailed record of behavior in typical events, (2) to discover in those detailed records discrepancies from the typical patterns that emerged from the broadgauge descriptive evidence found ..., and (3) to discover underlying principles of organization in the conduct of speaking.

The selection of the segments to be transcribed also followed Erickson's guidelines. Gumperz (1982a:134) summarizes them as follows: 'The passages in question may vary in length but must be self-contained episodes for which we have either internal or ethnographic evidence of what the goals are in terms of which participants evaluate component utterances.'

At last these selected segments of the event were transcribed.

2.4.1 The transcription conventions

The transcription conventions to be used in this work were adapted from Tannen and Wallat (1987) (see key to transcription conventions). In choosing this particular coding and in adapting it, I have tried to follow Ochs' (1979) advice according to which 'one of the most important features of a transcript is that it should not have too much information' (p.44), so that it is easy to read. Tannen and Wallat (1987) provide an adequate model.

In the transcribed text, non-verbal acts were included separately *below* the utterance that accompanies them everytime they were relevant to the analysis, that is, when they were complementary to the participants' communication of intent. As

Ochs (1979:54) puts it:

We do not want a transcript that discourages the reader from integrating verbal and non-verbal acts. On the other hand we want a readable transcript, one that displays clearly and systematically utterances and contexts.

The analysis integrates transcribed bits of text by referring to the transcribed segment according to a code that allows the reader to trace that example to the complete segment in the appendix (in case the segment is not given in its entirety within the text). For example, "S1.EG4.L035-7." means: S1=segment #1, EG4=example #4, and L035-7=lines #035 to #037. This code before an example indicates it is the fourth example in the chapter, and that it comes from segment #1, lines 35 through 37.

A remark about the transcripts is in order. Since there were many references to numbers in the business conversations, I have used figures unless there was some reason for the numbers to be spelled out in words. For instance, when there was emphasis on a part of the number, it was spelled out in words due to that special emphasis, e.g. "five two eight." When there is no special emphasis on any part, the figure is used, e.g. "5 2 8."

Finally, the transcriptions do not use any respellings of participants' phonological idiosyncrasies unless they have some prosodic significance. This means that mispronounced words due to interference from Portuguese are not recorded. However, instances of what Preston (1985:333) calls 'allegro respellings' such as gonna, gotta, and wanna appear in the transcript without any 'negative or condescending attitude by the reporter toward his informant' (Preston 1985:329). They appear simply because the four main participants use both forms (has got to/gotta) at different times, and this changes the rhythm of their speech, just like the

contracted form doesn't has a different rhythm than does not.

In the next chapters I will look into specific structural elements in the event. The three main speech activities will be identified and described. Next I will discuss the organizational elements within the specific genre of talk which is characteristic of the activity of negotiation. This will then lead into the argumentation that the participants differ in the ways in which they make their points when arguing within the frame of negotiation. I will also show that these different stylistic strategies are consistent within the parties. Finally, the analysis will show that the different styles of point-making influence the way parties interpret each other's intent, thus affecting the development of the negotiation being enacted.

Chapter 3

Three Activities in the Event - What Participants Do Through Talk

In this chapter I intend to show that in the business event enacted at Courofatos, participants were engaged in three basic speech activities (Gumperz 1982). I also want to show what these activities are, and how they are signalled and inferred by the participants in the interaction. My purpose is twofold: to give an account of what the participants did while they were together during the event, and to segment the data for the analysis of conversational styles in cross-cultural business negotiation. I believe, following Gumperz (1982a), that only after we have understood how participants 'have agreed on what activity is being enacted and how it is being conducted,' will we then be able to spot the 'perceptible break in rhythm, [the] shift of content and cues, or [the] mismatch between content and cues [that suggest] that something has gone wrong' (p.167). After this is done, I intend to focus on the activity of negotiation. This discussion will lead to a definition of negotiation as a genre of talk that differs from ordinary conversation in ways that will also be discussed in the following chapter.

3.1 The Framing of Speech Activities

In the preceding chapter, I provided an ethnographic description of what happened at the business encounters at Courofatos at the level of ethnographic description. This description focused on the event as a whole. Then, as now, I was

using Gumperz' (1982a:165) definition of *event* as those

units of verbal behavior bounded in time and space, [in which] behavior is governed by social [context- and network-specific] norms specifying participant roles, rights and duties vis-a-vis each other, permissible topics, appropriate ways of speaking and ways of introducing information.

The discussion to follow will examine the types of interaction that occurred *within* the event.

Two concepts will be instrumental for this discussion: activities and frames. I will identify how participants frame what they were doing together, and discuss what it is they were doing together. I believe participants' frames signal activities, and activities are what they *do*. So let me discuss these two terms.

The first of these notions is Gumperz' (1982a:131) activity or activity type, 'the basic socially significant unit of interaction in terms of which meaning is assessed.' This is a dynamic concept stemming from 'the process which develops and changes as participants interact.' It reflects something that participants actually *do* in the interaction. According to Gumperz, 'the activity type does not determine meaning but simply constrains interpretations by channelling inferences so as to *foreground* or make relevant certain aspects of background knowledge and to underplay others.'

Gumperz (1982a:2) also says that conversationalists rely on a series of inferences in order 'to derive *frames* [my emphasis] in terms of which they can interpret what is going on,' i.e. to interpret which activity is currently being enacted. Therefore, participants know what activity is under way because they are sensitive to the signals that frame it as this or that activity. This leads us to our second instrumental concept.

The definition of frame to be used here follows Tannen and Wallat (1987). These two authors present a differentiation of the concept of frame from all the other terms that refer to structures of expectation (Tannen 1979). They enlarge the concept in order to incorporate a sociological and anthropological sense that makes it markedly interactional rather than cognitive.

'The interactive notion of frame refers to a definition of what is going on in interaction, without which no utterance (or movement or gesture) could be interpreted' (Tannen and Wallat 1987:206). In other words, it is the posing and answering by conversationalists of a constant question regarding what kind of game is being played, so that meaning and interaction can be built adequately in a cooperative way.

Goffman's (1981:128) notion of footing ('a kind of frame that identifies the relationship between speakers' Tannen 1986:90) helps us understand how 'participants frame events,' and how they 'negotiate relationships or "alignments," that constitute those events' (Tannen and Wallat 1987:207). Goffman suggests a number of different shifts that cue the changes in participants' frames for events 'as they change the alignment they take up to themselves and others present...' (1981:128).

Goffman says these shifts, or cues, work similarly to code switching behavior (initially described by Gumperz and his associates), even if there is no 'code switch at all' (1981:127). Even though Gumperz and Goffman refer basically to prosodic and non-verbal elements, it is correct to use register (a concept closely akin to code) in the identification of the framings of the activities within the event.

This is exactly what Tannen & Wallat (1987) did in their analysis of a pediatric interview in which the doctor had to single-handedly manage the framing of three different activities. The authors used the concept of register as their main criterion for the identification of three frames, within which the doctor performed three activities, namely playing with the child in order to examine her, conversing with the mother to explain to her what the child's actual condition is, and reporting the case to students through the recording of the event.

Register will thus be used here as well to identify the interactional frames in the larger business event, and to subsequently isolate one of the framed activities for the analysis of cross-cultural communication.

A clarification must be made about this 'crucial linguistic component of register' (Tannen and Wallat 1987:208). It is used here as a major criterion for frame identification that will tell us which are the three main activities in the event. When discussing forms of speech, Hymes (1974:58-60) refers to register as the term that has gained acceptance when situation-specific use is in question. He says:

The notion of register broaches a perspective that may be called *speech styles*. We can understand the perspective as applying to any and all organization of linguistic features, of verbal means, in relation to a social context. (p.59)
 "Registers," for example, are not chosen only because a situation demands them; they may be chosen to define a situation, or to discover its definition by others (as when a choice can be taken in two different ways, depending on the relationship). (p.112)

Thus register is use-related variation in verbal language in general that is related to the way people position themselves as far as social context is concerned. Here I will specifically refer to register in terms of the participants' lexical choices as they

organize their time together.

Register is used here because it is the cue that stands out most in the data. In addition, register is an elegant and economic tool which does not involve any special ability or training, as do the analysis of prosody and non-verbal communication.

3.2 The Three Macro Frames in the Business Interaction

The analysis that follows will demonstrate that three superordinate, or macro, frames are at work in the interaction of the American and Brazilian businessmen. The reason for the use of the qualifiers *superordinate* or *macro* is that the activities to be identified below are not claimed to be the only ones present in the event, for as Gumperz puts it, 'one should not expect to be able to find a limited set of speech activities' in an event (1982a:166). Rather, they are claimed to be the most readily identified, the most evident in the data.

In addition, each one of them is built in tandem by all participants, so they are relatively stable. Thus I will identify only those framings of the interaction to which the qualifiers macro, stable, or cooperatively-shared, may be attributed.

The segment to be used as the basis for the discussion is representative of the whole interaction because each one of these three frames are present in it. This exchange took place in the very beginning of the event. At the point where it was recorded, Harry and Charles had been at the factory for approximately one and a half hours, after having been picked up at the airport. The recording of this stretch is available in audiotapes only.

The segment starts with a discussion of some technical

The first of the three macro frames appears in the initial part of the segment (for full transcription of the segment, please see appendix). Here each one of the three participants use a register that is typically technical. It concerns the products they deal with: leather goods.

```

>001 R    now two things... concerning.. the 1714 (2.7) we make=
>002      =this sample with this... binding,
003 C    right (1.5)
004 R    or (2.3) we could try to do something similar, you know,=
          [acc]
>005      =to avoid the "raw edge....

```

The mention of reference numbers along with the technical features of the referred good, without any connection with costs, works as another signal of this frame such as in line 8:

Another cue is the use of brand names, as in lines 38-39,

where the brand names appear as basis for the setting of technical production precedents; they are not naming competitors to be beaten:

S1.EG3.L038-9.

>038 H () I saw a (Dutch Cashman) with that.

>039 C (Dutch), I think they're putting a binding on.

Following Goffman's (1981:128) notions of footing and alignment, within this particular frame the three participants clearly signal where they stand toward one another in the activity. These stances are specific to this activity. Let us see what they are.

Roberto is the manufacturer. He is supposed to make sure the customers are getting the product as specified, and to suggest changes in case he cannot provide the exact specifications required. This can be seen in lines 1-5 transcribed below once again:

S1.EG4.L001-5.

>001 R now two things... concerning.. the 1714 (2.7) we make=

>002 =this sample with this... binding,

003 C right (1.5)

>004 R or (2.9) we could try to do something similar, you know,=
(acc)

>005 =to avoid the raw edge....

At this point Roberto makes sure that what was agreed is still valid, and offers a suggestion, for which later on (line 27) he will make a sales pitch:

S1.EG5.L025-8.

025 C /oh, you can't turn it in./

026 H Charlie, it looks.... it looks gorgeous.

>027 R Looks VERY GOOD.. I think it'd look better than=

028 =this.

Here the use of the verb think reveals a metamessage in keeping with Roberto's alignment in the frame, which says: "I know it's up to you, since you're the buyers, but my feeling is that this is better for you."

Within this particular frame Charles is especially talkative,

and this is obviously due to the alignment he takes vis-a-vis the others in it. He is the one responsible for technical matters at the importing company. Leather goods manufacturing specifications are his area of expertise, since he is an experienced ex-manufacturer. This is evident in lines 23-25:

S1.EG6.L023-5.

023 H =case... the extended edge case that they'd turned in,
 024 C [yeah.
 >025 C /oh, you can't turn it in./

Here Charles is contradicting his associate and superior Harry. His remark is the source of a short debate that follows exactly because Charles is entitled to know better about technical matters. This is only true about the specific area of technicalities which comes to the foreground within this particular frame. In the other activities his participation is secondary, and no debate would follow any of his remarks, unless he made a point of it.

The third participant, Harry, stands here as the chief importer, the buyer. Ultimately, he is the one who must hear the questions and suggestions of the manufacturer, the doubts and concerns of his technical consultant, and then have the last word. This becomes clear in the passage below:

S1.EG7.L014-9.

014 C [oh, yeah?
 015 H remember we discussed? oh, you weren't at that meeting. =
 016 =they're having MAJOR problems in raw edge.. and I said.. =
 017 =ok, you can turn it in.. I prefer this binding... better=
 018 =than this.
 019 C [oh, yeah.... no, very definitely.. yeah, definitely.

In the passage transcribed above, Harry condescended to the exporter's inability to produce the item as specified (with a raw edge), and then he overruled the recommendation of his consultant, Charles, in line 26, as can be seen below.

S1.EG8.L026.

>026 H charlie, it looks.... it looks gorgeous.

which he then repeated in line 31, thus curtailing the debate.

S1.EG9.L031-4.

- 031 H Charlie, that looks gorgeous.
 032 C yeah? (1.2)
 033 H they're having nightmares on it.
 034 C /alright./

3.2.2 Small talk

The second frame of interaction to be presented is similar to what Goffman (1981:125) calls the "small talk" that may well initiate and terminate the transaction - a mini version of the "preplay" and "postplay" that bracket larger social affairs.

From line 199 on, what we have is the small talk terminating the encounter for the time being.

S1.EG10.L199-216.

- >199 R /yeah./ (4.5) /alright/ (1.5)
 200 H alright.. can we go back to the hotel?
 201 R SURE.
 202 H so I can unpack, (2.5) and:: (3.0)
 203 R so what's up for tonight? I mean, do you feel like going=
 204 =out for dinner?
 205 H of course... I'm not going to sleep... if I go to sleep=
 206 =now, I'll be up at twelve o'clock at night..
 207 R ok:
 (laughs)
 208 H Charlie will sleep in the restaurant.
 209 R (laughs)
 210 C don't worry. (2.0) no:: problem. (3.0)
 211 R ok... so:: uh:: alright so I'll (meet you) tonight..=
 212 =I'll get the car.
 213 H what about that crazy guy there?
 214 R yeah, I'm gonna call him up.
 215 H ↑ Tell him we just flew in from NY he can come in and=
 >216 =spend a few minutes with us.

The list of lexical items that appear in this frame indicate a different selection from the list of lexical items characterizing the previous frame of manufacturing specifications talk. Below we have some of these words listed next to the numbers of the lines in which they appear.

{ hotel 200	unpack 202	dinner 204
{ sleep 205	restaurant 208	car 212

{ No technical matter was being discussed. The participants use

colloquial words, but, what is more important to the framing of the activity, they used all words colloquially. Line 203 ("so what's up for tonight?") shows Roberto making an invitation on very informal terms. Line 210 ("no:: problem.") has Charles responding to the remark about his sleepiness with a vowel elongation that is typical of relaxed friendliness.

As far as alignment goes, participants now have roughly the same status: they are business friends, though Roberto is still the host, and Harry and Charles are the guests. We therefore have a new context, taking context to be 'those interactionally constituted environments embedded in time that can change' from moment to moment' (Erickson and Shultz 1977:148).

As a result of this change in context we also have a new participation structure, a 'new configuration of [this] concerted action', in which, 'the role relationships among participants are redistributed,' and 'the rights and obligations of interactants' have to be readjusted (Erickson and Shultz 1977:148).

This change in the participation structure brought about by the change in context and frame is evident in Harry's use of the adjective form crazy (line 213) referring to Eduardo, who at that point had not yet come in to greet the Americans.

S1.EG11.L213.

>213 H what about that crazy guy there?

Crazy guy is immediately perceived by Roberto as an affectionate reference to Eduardo by Harry, which within this frame means about the same as "where is my buddy Eduardo?". Were this form to be used in the negotiation frame to be discussed next, without any reframing cue, it would probably be interpreted as an offense of the caliber of "where is the unreasonable

manufacturer I am forced to deal with?".

Along this same line, Harry's use of a directive with no redressive action (line 215) could also be taken as a face-treatening act (Brown and Levinson 1978). However, here Harry's order is seen as a token of his friendship for Eduardo, as an attempt to establish common ground. Eduardo and Harry stand as business associates in the other frames.

S1.EG12.L215-6.

>215 H ↑ Tell him we just flew in from NY he can come in and=
216 =spend a few minutes with us.

Laughs (lines 207 and 209) and grimaces are also two important contextualization cues of this activity. I must stress that the activity that is being called small talk includes a number of different genres of conversation such as jokes (lines 208-210) and anecdotes.

S1.EG13.L205-10.

205 H of course... I'm not going to sleep... if I go to sleep=
206 =now, I'll be up at twelve o'clock at night..
>207 R ok:
[laughs]
>208 H Charlie will sleep in the restaurant.
>209 R [laughs]
>210 C don't worry. (2.0) no:: problem. (3.0)

The activity "small talk" seems to serve a number of purposes in the event. Among them I indicate the relieving of tension, and the opening up of opportunities for clarification of intent through metatalk. These aspects are not going to be explored here, since we will focus hereon only on the activity of negotiation proper to be presented next.

3.2.3 Negotiation talk

The third frame that can be identified in the segment is business negotiation. Participants were then engaged in defending either one of two clear-cut sides in any matter. There were buyers

and sellers; importers and exporters, i.e. two opposing sides of interests that must compromise at some point so that any of the interests concerned could be satisfied.

The register used from line 42 onwards, when the frame starts to switch from manufacturing specifications to business negotiation, is quite different from the registers used in the two contexts described before. The lexical items in this activity seem to be balls of a different game. Some of these words are sampled below.

cooperate 42	promises 52	volume 56
production 60	productivity 65	business 70
million dollars 79	FOB 82	goods 85
negotiations 106	position 107	money 112
price 124	buy 139	buyer and seller 160-1
competitors 166	merchandise 167	marketing 183

Even a word like production, mentioned to illustrate the technical register of the manufacturing specifications frame (line 13), when used within this particular frame of business negotiation acquires a different meaning that is obvious to both participants and observers. Whereas in line 13, problems in production referred to the process of craftsmanship involved in producing each individual item, in lines 60 and 69, to increase production refers to the ability to generate a larger volume of merchandise. In other words, what in the previous frame was process is now interpreted as product. The difference in meaning is made possible due to the different framing of the activity in which the noun production is being uttered.

Apart from the register used in this activity, what is crucial in this new footing is that there are only two parties for the three existing participants. Not only is that crucial for the identification of this activity among others in the event, it is

also crucial for our definition of what negotiation is as a genre of talk. This definition will be provided in due time. For the time being, it is important to see how this team work occurs.

Team work characterizes the type of participation structure (Philips 1972; Erickson and Shultz 1977; Shultz, Florio and Erickson 1982) which prevails in the activity of negotiation. Participation structures refer to the 'patterns in the allocation of interactional rights and obligations among all members who were enacting a social occasion together' (Shultz, Florio and Erickson 1982:12). When negotiation starts, these rights and obligations change, contrasting sharply with their counterparts in the activity of small talk.

Roberto was always the target for both Harry's and Charles' contributions. Within this frame both importers use we instead of I. This pronoun usage is different from the pronoun usage in the other activities, where they all stand as individuals. Here they stand as one party, one team. This can be seen in lines 45-47 below.

S1.EG14.L045-7.

045 H Lyou know=
 >046 =they have problems.... and if we're working together, we=
 >047 =have to understand their problems. (2.0) so we'll cooperate=

The first we encompasses everyone, the others mark a boundary between the two parties. Thus the American importers stand as a single unit against Roberto. Within the American team, inside the importer side of the court, Harry is the leader - a primary participant in Shultz, Florio & Erickson's (1982) terms -, whereas Charles is there to support him, as in lines 162-5:

S1.EG15.L162-5.

162 H =think that ... what all of us have have accomplished... in=
 163 =one year is is.. incre^dible.
 >164 C [phenomenon... it really is,
 165 H [could=

In the exchange above, as in other occasions, Charles just reinforced Harry's points. Many times their contributions are latched so that they talk smoothly as a single party, as above, or as in lines 124-131 below. To use Falk's (1979 cited in Tannen 1984:61) term, they are dueting.

S1.EG16.L124-31.

124 H and.. we have to feel comfortable.... that when we price=
 125 =our goods, (1.5) that we're able to maintain that=
 >126 =pricing for a year
 >127 C we don't change.
 >128 H we: can't change
 >129 C we never change, we are known... that=
 130 =we keep our pricing.
 131 H Oh, the whole industry, nobody raises their price... I=

Lines 126 to 129 are clear examples of the dueting pattern in the American negotiators' talk: "we're able to maintain that pricing for a year/ we don't change/ we can't change/ we never change." Harry and Charles' latched contributions produce a cohesive strengthening effect to the party's arguing.

The Brazilian team lacks one player on the exporter side of the court in this particular segment. This might be one reason for Roberto's extreme discomfort, which we can infer from the hedges, pauses, hesitations, and changes of pitch in his speech. Lines 63-66 show examples of that.

S1.EG17.L063-6.

063 R you know, as I told you, we... uh: (1.7) we had these.. uh=
 064 =four meetings with uh two different engineers.... to talk..=
 065 =specifically about (1.5) /productivity/... I've been=
 066 =down to Argentina about three or four times because here=

Roberto was constantly being bombarded with a series of remarks and complaints from Harry and Charles. He was always the target of this heavy artillery, even when the two importers were apparently talking only to each other, as in lines 42-54.

S1.EG18.L042-54.

042 H look, (come on you), we have to cooperate,
 043 C [yeah, I know=
 044 =there's no question about it.
 045 H [you know=
 046 =they have problems.... and if we're working together, we=
 047 =have to understand their problems. (2.0) so we'll cooperate=
 048 =(1.8) this is a long term program, this isn't just a:
 049 C [no,=
 050 =I understand that...
 051 H [look, I think you agree that=
 052 =whatever we promised, we fulfilled our promises (1.2) I=
 053 =mean, we came through (on) every conceivable way,
 054 R uh huh.

What we have above is typically what Goffman (1981:134) calls an innuendo,

...whereby a speaker [Harry], ostensibly directing words to an addressed recipient [Charles], overlays his remarks with a patent but deniable meaning, a meaning that has a target more so than the recipient, and is meant to be caught by the target.

The ^{also} target in this exchange was the unaddressed recipient Roberto. Roberto was clearly unaddressed; the use of you in line 42 is directed exclusively to Charles, since the participation structure in the exchange shows Charles' immediate response.

The example above reveals three things. First, it shows that Harry was able to change his footing in the interaction through the innuendo. He incorporated the we against the they, and invited Charles to join in. Second, since the two other participants ratified Harry's new footing (Charles readily joined in the we, and Roberto soon accepted his alignment as not being a part of those we), there is a new framing of the event. Third, the example reveals the transition of the previous activity (manufacturing specifications) into business negotiation.

What is also remarkable is the fact that because the event was reframed, and a new activity started being enacted, Roberto never got to the second item of the series of two he had initially proposed (line 1: now two things...). He was never able to

introduce the second expected element of the pair because it belonged in the manufacturing specifications activity, which was not again enacted until the day after.

At this point the three main activities in the event have been identified, and both the data and the focus of the analysis to follow will henceforth be restricted to the activity of negotiation.

In the next chapter I will discuss the organizational aspects that make negotiation talk a different genre of talk from that of ordinary conversation. Then I will discuss two other concepts: conversational style and cross-cultural communication. These concepts will be essential to the analysis, especially when I present the two different point-making styles with which the participants of the business event at Courofatos argued in negotiation.

Chapter 4

Conversational Styles in Cross-Cultural Business Negotiation

Negotiation talk, cross-cultural communication and conversational styles will now be discussed. The theoretical issues in these domains will establish the methodological premises of my analysis of the 'inferential problems that arise when [the Brazilian and American negotiators'] different background expectations are employed in the interpretation of a single message' (Gumperz 1982a:167).

4.1 Negotiation

Negotiation will be referred to here in Francis' (1986:54) sense. He defines it as 'that talk which goes on within, and which comprises, the social setting of "negotiations."' From this perspective, negotiation is a term naming a number of different concepts and excluding others. I will now discuss this briefly.

First, negotiation here is not to be taken as a general term referring to 'certain kinds of sequential structures through which interpersonal difficulties, such as problems in understanding or agreement, are handled by conversationalists' (Francis 1986:54). Francis points out that this is the current usage for the term in many studies in conversation analysis; not in his work, not here either.

Because negotiation talk is seen as the talk that comprises the social setting, negotiation can also name the entire event. Interestingly enough, Charles, Eduardo, Harry and Roberto tended

to refer to the entire event as "negotiations," even though, as I have shown, a lot of what goes on, of what is *done*, is not negotiation in the sense that the activity negotiation is.

The fact that the participants called the whole event held at Courofatos "the negotiations" tells us that it is a goal oriented event like those Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:11) say are especially apt for the analysis of cultural expectations.

They are goal oriented in the sense that each aims to *get* something done, i.e., to reach an agreement, to evaluate abilities, or to get advice. These goals are a defining characteristic of the situation in question. The fact that these overall goals exist and are shared by the participants provides us with a participants' viewpoint for judging when something goes wrong. Thus as a first step in the analysis, by simply looking at the content of what transpires, it is possible to judge to what extent communication has succeeded or failed.

What makes this talk so peculiarly determinant of the whole event? What exactly makes the genre of talk *negotiation* that is characteristic of this business negotiation activity (within the event "the negotiations") so markedly different from ordinary conversation?

4.1.1 Genre

The definition of genre as it is being used here comes from Kress (1985:19). Negotiation as an activity described above is a conventionalized form of an occasion, an event, and Kress says that these forms 'lead to conventionalized forms of texts, to specific GENRES' (his emphasis). In his words, 'genres have specific forms and meanings, deriving from and encoding the functions, purposes and meanings of the social occasions.' In this sense, negotiation is a genre of talk, the main genre of talk used in the negotiation activity discussed above.

If texts are 'the sites of attempts to resolve particular problems' (Kress 1985:12), the genre of negotiation talk is probably one of the genres that produces the most fitting texts to that definition. Unlike ordinary conversation, negotiation involves participants whose goals many times are vastly conflicting. However, these same participants must at some point compromise their conflicts, for one single outcome must be reached for all, and, if possible, for the benefit of all.

In more objective terms, negotiation talk involves two distinct organizational aspects that set it apart from ordinary conversations: in Francis' (1986:55) words '(a) what the participants talk *about* [i.e., the topic], and (b) who they talk *as*' [i.e., the participation structure]. Let us discuss the second aspect first.

4.1.2 Participation structure in negotiation talk

When negotiating, participants are engaged in something similar to playing a team sport. According to Francis (1986:55), it is a feature of negotiations to have disputants organized in - talking *as* - parties. Referring specifically to negotiations in industrial settings such as the one at Courofatos, Francis says these parties are often 'represented by a "team" of negotiators. Such teams can have "spokesmen" and may also contain "specialists" on specific matters pertaining to the dispute.'

As was demonstrated, the two Americans were speaking as a team in that particular segment, and their framing of the interaction where Roberto was part of the they showed very clearly that the team was restricted to Harry and Charles. In various

other moments the two Brazilians also stood as a team, though not as markedly as the two Americans. This will be evident in the discussion on stylistic differences in point-making.

In addition, if we look at the American party for example, we see from the segment discussed above that Harry was the spokesman, and that Charles was the specialist in their team. While Charles could be the primary speaker at any time in the activity of manufacturing specifications, his technical expertise was much less foregrounded in the activity of negotiation. His participation would become relevant mainly when some technical aspect entered into the dispute.

The dispute which Francis mentions in his definition of negotiation talk also applies to the negotiation at Courofatos. The dispute at Courofatos had to do with two contentions.

Basically, it concerned the volume of future orders and a decision about the production of new items, (especially 4 or 5 items to be added to an existing collection of portfolios). But ultimately, it concerned the setting of prices for these new items.

As far as quantities were concerned, Courofatos did not want to increase volumes significantly. As a consequence, while Courofatos was not interested in adding many new styles, Amage saw an increase in volume as extremely positive, and the addition of new styles as mandatory for that increase in volume to come about.

Concerning prices, Amage obviously wanted to buy the items for as cheap a price as possible, in order to be able to sell competitively. Courofatos on the other hand, especially because it was not so interested in large volumes, wanted to guarantee a reasonable price that would give it some leeway to handle the

expected fluctuation both in the exchange rate and in the prices of leather during the upcoming year.

4.1.3 Topical coherence in negotiation talk

Let us now discuss Francis' first and more relevant point to the analysis to follow here. It has to do with what participants talk about.

According to Francis (1986:55),

Negotiating involves talking about certain kinds of things, that is, those matters which the parties disagree on and which they are in dispute over, or matters which are relevant to their dispute. Therefore there are constraints upon topicality in negotiation talk which are not operative in ordinary conversation.

What the above remarks imply is that in this genre of talk, topical coherence is local, meaning that 'a current utterance preferably should be topically coherent with the immediately prior utterance' (p.55). The relevance of this to the analysis of point-making styles in the negotiation event at Courofatos lies in the fact that the two parties' stylistic conventions entail different expectations of how local topical coherence is usually accomplished.

Francis says that whenever the adherence to the norm of local topical coherence is for some reason relaxed, it must be signalled by participants by means of a return, an 'utterance ... designed to indicate to co-participants that it is occasioned not by its local sequential environment, but by some earlier topical items' (1986:56). This is necessary again because, in negotiation talk, *relevance* takes precedence over consistency.

Along this line of thought, Francis (1986:61) observes that negotiation talk requires that participants clearly establish the

relevance of their remarks to the dispute that brought about the negotiation. What happened many times in the negotiation at Courofatos - as I will demonstrate in chapters 5 and 6 - was that while the Brazilian negotiators saw no reason to state the relevance of their remarks, the American negotiators saw no reason to wait until those remarks became relevant and thus coherent.

All this entails that the signaling of topical coherence is of paramount importance in negotiation. It is even more so than in ordinary conversation because of the need for this topical coherence to be locally accomplished.

According to Francis (1986:61), local topical coherence can be accomplished through what he calls 'topic weaving', that is, 'by making reference to previous topics or to putative future ones, participants can sustain a sense of relatedness of "what is being talked of now" with "what has gone before" and "what is yet to come."' Francis adds that it is through topic weaving that 'participants may also seek to accomplish interactional activities which further their purposes as parties to negotiations.'

Now if this interactional device depends upon the effective signaling of local topical coherence, the signaling system between parties must be shared. That is the rub, for participants in cross-cultural encounters may not share the same topic weaving system.

In the event at Courofatos, participants in the two teams came from different cultural traditions. Therefore I had reasons to believe that they did not share some ways of signaling local topical coherence and of interpreting the other team's signals. This was confirmed in the research. The two teams displayed

different stylistic choices when arguing their points, which in turn created problems of communication between the two parts.

4.2 Conversational Style in Cross-Cultural Communication

4.2.1 Conversational style

Conversational style is a broad term. 'Many linguists ... consider the totality of discourse devices that signal the imprint of a specific culture on an individual's speech to be the domain of style' (Odlin, 1989:55/6).

Speech carries the imprints of the speaker's cultural marks. These marks are the features of conversational style. Tannen (1981a:223) lists them as including

use of pitch, loudness and pacing; turn taking mechanisms; storytelling, including when and how the story is introduced, ~~what the point is, how it is revealed, and listenership;~~ topic, including which are preferred, how they are introduced, and with how much persistence; humor, irony, and sarcasm; and so on. (emphasis added)

According to Tannen (1981a:223), 'what people say and how they say it -constitute[s] conversational style.' Discussing the concept in more detail, Tannen (1984) argues that conversational style is a reflection and a component of the individual's personality.

Anything you say must be said at a certain rate, at a certain pitch and amplitude, in certain intonation at a certain point in the interaction. All these and countless other choices determine the effect of an utterance in interaction and influence judgments that are made both about what is said and about the speaker who says it. All these and countless other choices determine a speaker's style.
(p.8)

Therefore a varied array of elements can alternate and/or co-occur (Ervin-Trip 1972) in a speaker's speech to compose his/her style, and the shared features observed in speakers of the

same background will constitute that ethnic group's style.

However, a word of caution is in order here. The fact that conversational style is a mark of culture upon speech, and also a part of the individual's personality, should by no means imply any behavioristic conclusion that an individual is a result of its environment. What this means, in fact, is that 'each person's conversational style is a combination of features learned in interaction (hence social) plus features developed idiosyncratically' (Tannen 1984:10). Thus conversational style is, at once and inseparably, socially shared and personally differentiated.

Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:7) thus say that language is where 'social identity and ethnicity are in large part established and maintained.' They corroborate Tannen's (1981a:236) statement summarizing conversational style as 'both a consequence and indicator of ethnicity.'

Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:7) also state that 'a common ethnicity that includes a common communicative history would insure the transmission of strategies which would be shared by most.' However, the development of modern industrialized societies with a high degree of technological complexity has greatly altered the transmission of these strategies, so that today many people interact with people with whom they do not share these strategies.

This is definitely the case at Courofatos, where Southern Brazilians and Northeastern Americans interact intensively during many consecutive hours. It is in situations like this, typical of technological societies, that 'diversity of background and communicative conventions come to take on important signalling

functions in everyday interaction' (Gumperz 1982a:7).

These communicative conventions compose conversational style and they are not readily apparent like other cultural marks upon speech such as accent or grammar. Since people whose styles differ are interacting more and more frequently nowadays, it is important that we understand why these interactions are often difficult. As Tannen (1981b:144) aptly puts it,

Style is often invisible. People tend to take their conversational habits as self-evident and draw conclusions not about others' linguistic devices but about their intentions or personalities. However, few speakers are aware of ways in which others' linguistic behavior may be a reaction to their own.

4.2.2 Cross-cultural communication

The previous discussion about conversational styles has indicated what cross-cultural communication is all about: people from different cultural traditions coming into contact with one another, having 'to sustain social interaction and have their goals and motives understood' (Gumperz 1982a:7) through language.

Thomas (1983:91) uses the term "cross-cultural" ... as a shorthand way of describing not just native-non-native interactions, but any communication between two people who, in any particular domain, do not share a common linguistic or cultural background.'

Although this broad sense seems to be widely used today, this is not the case here. Our subjects clearly fall into the categories native and non-native, as far as the language and culture of interaction are concerned, or native and foreign, as far as the location of the encounter is concerned. In spite of this, they have shared interests at stake. They came into one

another's presence specifically for the purpose of getting something done: striking an import-export deal. Therefore, the negotiations at Courofatos are a case of cross-cultural communication *par excellence*.

I will now integrate this theoretical discussion with the methodological aspects of how I went about on the interpretive part of my research on that event.

4.3 Analysis of Conversational Styles in the Cross-Cultural Business Negotiation at Courofatos

In the present analysis I have followed the procedures outlined by Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:10) below:

In order to understand and evaluate a situation from a member's perspective, the researchers need to be fully involved in the everyday affairs of the organization. They need to know what participants' aims and expectations are in addition to observing what happens.

As previously stated, the negotiations at Courofatos represent one of those goal oriented events which, according to Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a), 'provide[s] us with a participants' viewpoint for judging when something goes wrong' (p. 11). They argue that the analyst will step into the analysis 'by simply looking at the content of what transpires ... [and judging] to what extent communication has succeeded or failed' (p.11). This is what I meant by "looking at the uncomfortable moments in the interaction" to then isolate segments for analysis (chapter 2).

After various uncomfortable moments were spotted - and there were many in the meetings at Courofatos -, I began to see the emergence of different stylistic patterns in arguing in the activity of negotiation.

In negotiation, arguing is a major communicative task ('an abstract semantic concept defined in terms of semantic ties among component utterances'). Two different patterns in the performance of a single communicative task seemed to be symptomatic, since Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:11/12) say that 'inferences about what these ties are underlie interpretations of what is going on, what is intended, and what is being accomplished.'

Thus by looking at the way the parties argued I could see more and more clearly that there were two different ways (styles) of performing that task, and that they had something to do with the generation of those uncomfortable moments in the interaction.

I thus proceeded, trying to look more closely at the two ways of arguing. As Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:12) put it:

Although the pragmatic conditions of communicative tasks are theoretically taken to be universal, the realization of these tasks as ~~social practices are culturally variable.~~ This variation can be analyzed from several *different perspectives*, all of which of course co-occur in the actual practices. (emphasis added)

Of the several *different perspectives* (actually three) pointed out by Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, I will look at the second, specifically, at 'different ways of structuring information or an argument in a conversation' (p.12). It has to do with 'issues traditionally covered in rhetorical analysis and deals with such phenomena as sequencing of arguments and with decisions about what needs to be stated and what must be conveyed indirectly' (p.13).

Since early in my research I had identified instances in which the participants created uncomfortable moments when I had no reason to suspect their intentions were not the best possible. By specifically analyzing how Roberto and Eduardo made their points,

I could see that the examples were consistently patterned, and that the pattern was different from Harry and Charles'.

In looking at how the two patterns were related to the creation of those uncomfortable moments, I could see that there was a cause-effect relationship between them.

I analyzed the recorded material and the transcription of various uncomfortable moments when Charles, Eduardo, Harry and Roberto were making their points and performing communicative tasks of arguing within the activity of negotiation. The approach of my analysis was to combine my participant-observation of the event with the detailed observation of the audiovisual primary data, and with the microanalysis of the transcribed data. I was faithful to the ethnographic 'concern for breadth of view in its two aspects: an emphasis on holism and on comparison' (Erickson 1988:1083). I carried out, on the one hand, a comparative interpretation of the two point-making patterns, and, on the other hand, a holistic interpretation of the event.

Regarding the interpretive character of my analysis, I once again followed Gumperz (1982a) when he says that:

Interpretation ... requires first of all judgements of expectedness and then a search for an interpretation that makes sense in terms of what we know from past experience and what we have perceived. We can never be certain of the ultimate meaning of any message, but by looking at systematic patterns in the relationship of perception of surface cues to interpretation, we can gather strong evidence for the social basis of contextualization conventions and for the signalling of communicative goals.
(p.170)

The findings of this analysis will be reported in the next two chapters. Chapter 5 will describe the two point-making patterns that are typical of the two parties' conversational

styles, and the contexts that may constrain the use of those typical strategies. Chapter 6 will analyze four different types of communication problems resulting from stylistic clashes.

Chapter 5

Two Styles of Making a Point in Negotiation

This chapter will discuss the organization of information for point-making in the negotiation. This is a major contrastive feature of the participants' conversational styles. Following a discussion of the terms *point* and *point making*, the two different patterns of point-making identified in the speech of the four participants will be described. Then the analysis will proceed to demonstrate under what circumstances participants chose point-making strategies that were different from the recurrent pattern in each of the styles.

5.1 Point and Point-Making

Before I describe how the two negotiating parties argued their points, I must define what is to be understood by point and point-making.

Negotiators have goals, but negotiations have outcomes. When arguing in negotiation, participants have to compromise. Often some aspects regarding the accomplishment of their goals are often in conflict with the other party's goals. Participants know that a common outcome must be agreed upon for the event to be successful. So participants in one party have to convince the other party that their interests need to be attended to.

This, however, must not only be said, like in ordinary conversation, it must be communicated cogently. There is a need for the participants in a party to persuade the other side so that

the persuading party's interests and goals are recognized and established as priorities.

This interactional game of persuasion is reminiscent of a tug of war. Two teams are fighting for some common territory and every move on one side is immediately reflected on the other. In negotiation talk, this reflection on the other side is equivalent to the particular kind of sequencing of turns (local topical coherence) where the topic of the last utterance on one side will probably be taken up by the other side (relevance takes precedence over consistency).

The analogy stops short though. In a tug of war a team's physical strength and skill will eventually result in the defeat of the other team. Unlike the tug of war, however, arguing in negotiation depends upon the party's intellectual skill and strength to produce effective reasoning with ~~the aim not of~~ defeating the other team, but of persuading it to take one's interests as their own.

The foundation of this effective reasoning is a number of statements, the points, that must be substantiated with some evidence. Statements and/or evidence may eventually be implicit; what is required is that both parties recognize them as being part of their context.

I use the term *point*, therefore, to refer exactly to those statements that summarize a party's view of reality at a given moment in the interaction.

Points are important because they must carry intent. Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:17) specify intent as 'the socially recognized communicative intent that is implied in particular

kinds of social activities signalled in discourse.' So what constitutes a point interactionally is the fact that it is recognized by the other party as carrying the load of interest of the party that produces the utterance being interpreted as a point.

Point-making, therefore, is the organization of the statement of intent - the point -, and of the information necessary to substantiate this point. Whether the point is effective and persuasive, or whether or not it is ratified by the other party, is unimportant to the definition of point-making. What is relevant to the making of a point is that it must be communicated as such. In other words, a point must be intended as carrying party A's intent, and it must be recognized by party B as carrying party A's intent. When this happens an instance of successful communication occurs.

As far as negotiation talk is concerned, point-making is an important organizational aspect, since it is through the cable of arguing points that local topical coherence will develop. And local topical coherence will determine the course of the interaction towards the common outcome between the parts.

What is even more remarkable is that all this depends upon conversational cooperation (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982a). Both parties must talk, persuade or be persuaded, if anything is to be accomplished, and this

involves not only communication through the use of words in their literal meanings, but construction across time of negotiated and situationally specific conventions for the interpretation of discourse tasks as well as the speaker's and listener's knowledge of how to conduct and interpret live performances.

(Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982a:17)

Ultimately, this means that there must be some shared conventions for how points are to be formatted, for example statement of point + support, or background information as support + statement of point. The same goes for how the interpretation of point-making is to be accomplished. In this sense the way of organizing the information that is intended to constitute a point in arguing in negotiation becomes a contextualization convention. It becomes 'one of the surface features of message form by which speakers signal and listeners interpret ... how semantic content is to be understood and *how* each sentence relates to what precedes or follows' (Gumperz 1982a:131).

The core of the present analysis lies in the argument that the two parties in the business negotiation at Courofatos did not share this convention. The fact that the signaling devices were not shared by the participants in the business event held at Courofatos had serious consequences for the process of negotiation, since, as was stated above, the interpretation of those signals affects local topic coherence, a key feature of negotiation talk.

According to Gumperz (1982a:172),

... individuals who speak English well and have no difficulty in producing grammatical English sentences [but whose cultural traditions vary, like Charles, Eduardo, Harry and Roberto] may nevertheless differ significantly in what they perceive as meaningful discourse cues. ... [They make different assumptions] about what information is to be conveyed, how it is to be ordered and put into words, and their ability to fill un verbalized information ... may also vary.

Let us now see how all this appears in the data.

5.2 Two Ways of Organizing Point and Support

5.2.1 Point-making importer style

The segment below comes from the second day of meetings, in the morning session. The participants were discussing potential items that Courofatos could import from Romenia and China via Amage:

S3.EG1.L001-13.

001 H I don't think you would be accomplishing anything. (2.8)
002 R well, we wouldn't be talking about quantities.. in this=
003 =case.. ()
>004 H [if you can't buy quantities, they're not interested.=
[acc]
>005 =(2.0) the Chinese aren't interested.. I mean if you're gonna=
>006 =order three four hundred pieces, / (or five hundred) / they're=
>007 =not interested. (1.8) Especially the factories we deal=
>008 =with, which are the two biggest factories in China, (1.5)=
>009 =they need quantities... that's why we're important to them.=
>010 =(1.4) y'know, we gave them almost two million dollars worth=
>011 =of portfolio business... right on the spot. (1.8) that's=
[snaps fingers]
>012 =what they're interested in.
[creaky voice]

013 R right.

The main characteristic of point-making importer style is that it is direct and "classically organized." It is very similar to the organization of paragraphs according to English language writing manuals. It is also pretty similar to Aristotle's definition of speech in *Rhetoric* (p.1414^a), which says:

A speech has two parts. You must state your case, and you must prove it. You cannot either state your case and omit to prove it, or prove it without having first stated it: since any proof must be a proof of something, and the only use of a preliminary statement is the proof that follows it. Of these two parts the first is called the Statement of the case, the second part the Argument, just as we distinguish between Enunciation and Demonstration.

Harry's turn transcribed above fits Aristotle's definition of "speech," which is what I want to call point-making. What the Greek philosopher calls a statement is here referred to as the point, and what for him is an argument, here is referred to as

evidence, or background information, or yet supporting information.

Harry's style of point-making is direct. In the example above, the moment he realized that what Roberto had in mind clashed with what he felt was the actual case, he overlapped Roberto's turn in order to make his point.

S3.EG2.L002-4.

002 R well, we wouldn't be talking about quantities.. in this=

>003 =case. []

>004 H [if you can't buy quantities, they're not interested.=

In addition, in this particular example Harry stated his point without any introduction. The point was placed at the very beginning of his turn, and he then repeated it twice:

S3.EG3.L004-7.

>004 H [if you can't buy quantities, they're not interested.=
[acc]

>005 =(2.0) the Chinese aren't interested.. I mean if you're gonna=

>006 =order three four hundred pieces, /or five hundred/ they're=

>007 =not interested. (1.8) Especially the factories we deal=

The reiteration of points occurred frequently in Harry's speech during the event. This is interesting because Tannen (1987:599) says that 'East-European Jewish-Americans [like Harry and Charles] are a talk-valuing culture that favors syntactic repetition.' So we can start seeing how cultural identity is indeed expressed through talk and in point-making in this interaction.

Further evidence to this comes from the work of Kaplan (1966) reported by Odlin (1989:62): 'In Kaplan's analysis, writing in English resembles a straight line since it supposedly is direct and "to the point."' Thus Harry's style in formulating his argument is in keeping with the stylistic features of his language and of his ethnic group (Tannen 1981a, 1981b, 1984a).

Harry and Charles' use of a classically recommended

argumentative style when they make their points in the negotiation is also very effective because they not only communicated their intent; many times they involved their Brazilian interlocutors so deeply into their own argument that the Brazilians readily accepted Harry and Charles' interests as their own. This happened in the segment below, where Roberto (line 13) ended up providing support for Harry and Charles' points. The segment also shows Eduardo's perfect acknowledgement of the importers' point while he was talking to Roberto in Portuguese:

S10.EG4.L001-26.

- 001 H I was saying to Eduardo, (1.1) if we can bring this case=
 002 =down.. even though we'll pay a little more (1.1) we'll pay=
 003 =like 47 48 dollars, it's still ok for me /to buy it /from=
 004 =here...// cause then I have the whole collection.
 005 C [whole=
 006 =collection rather than buying one piece over there.
 007 H [it becomes one collection.... / because from=
 (facing Eduardo)
 008 =Czechoslovakia, I can use their collection to sell it to the=
 009 =discounters (1.1) ~~this collection we sell strictly to the=~~
 010 =independent luggage store, and department stores.... we=
 011 C [right. [and department stores.
 012 H we package it differently, we do everything different.
 >013 R different marketing.
 014 C yeah.
 015 H [totally.
 [model shop boy comes in, and talks to Roberto]
 >016 E a ideia entao deles e.. eles nao.. eles nao abrem mao da=
 >017 =colecão do Brasil (1.7)
 018 R voce chegou ainda a perguntar isso ai?
 (acc)
 >019 E eu disse pra ele tu tem que comprar esse entao (1.2) por esse=
 >020 =preço tem que comprar na na na na na
 >021 R [Czechoslovakia. (1.2)
 >022 E ai eles falaram e tal e tao.. querem agora:- eles aumentam o=
 >023 =preço, mas querem comprar toda a coleção daqui (2.0) daí=
 >024 =nos tamos fudidos (6.0)
 (starts chewing a paper clip)
 >025 R (fakes a grin in agreement)
 >026 E eles não deixam de ter razão, mas-

Harry's point-making transcribed above also shows the main difference between his [and Charles'] style against the two

Brazilians'. Besides being direct, their classical organization of point + evidence contrasts with the (not-so-classical) style of point-making used by Roberto and Eduardo.

5.2.2 Point-making exporter style

By looking once again at a stretch of the segment transcribed in the previous chapter, we can see a good example of Roberto's style of point-making.

S1 . EG5 . L059-69 .

059 H The question is whether you=
060 =have the ability- (1.8) to increase YOUR production....
061 R we'd also like to do that.. to get there.
062 H /vell... I'm I'm not.. totally.... convinced/ (1.8)
>063 R you know, as I told you, we... uh:: (1.7) we had these.. uh=
>064 =four meetings with uh two different engineers.... to talk..=
>065 =specifically about (1.5) /productivity/... I've been=
>066 =down to Argentina about three or four times because here=
>067 =() our major problem is supply, especially leather supply=
>068 =you know once we have leather.. here, to produce for you.=
>069 =we are positive that we're gonna increase.. uh.. production.(1.3)

Harry said (line 62) that he was 'not totally convinced' that Roberto (thus Courofatos) 'would also want to get there' (line 61), i.e. that they wanted to increase production. So Roberto's following arguing task was to assure Harry that his doubts concerning Courofatos were unfounded (lines 63-9). Roberto set out to make a point that the Brazilian factory was indeed willing to increase production. This statement, however, was the culmination of his turn. Only after having established some background information as the basis of his point, did he then state it.

Roberto first said that they had had meetings with engineers (line 64). Then he said that they had discussed productivity in those meetings (line 65). The word productivity was uttered quietly and between two pauses. It was his first evidence that his company was willing to increase production.

S1.EG6.L063-5.

- 063 R you know, as I told you, we... uh: (1.7) we had these.. uh=
 064 =four meetings with uh two different engineers.... to talk..=
 >065 =specifically about (1.5) /productivity/... I've been=

Then Roberto established the second piece of background information to support his upcoming point: they were looking for alternative sources of leather supply. This also came in indirectly at first. Roberto said he had been down to Argentina (lines 65-6). "What for?" - he expected his listener to be mentally asking - "because the problem is leather supply" - he answered.

S1.EG7.L065-7.

- 065 R =specifically about (1.5) /productivity/... I've been=
 >066 =down to Argentina about three or four times because here=
 >067 =() our major problem is supply, especially leather supply,=

Once the two aspects had been established, Roberto concluded his turn by stating the point:

S1.EG8.L068-9.

- >068 R =you know once we have leather.. here, to produce for you=
 >069 =we are positive that we're gonna increase...uh... production. (1.3)

This style of point-making is based on the premise that there will be high conversational involvement in the interaction. Tannen (1984a:18) says that 'by leaving maximal information for the hearer to fill in a speaker is creating involvement by requiring the hearer to participate in sensemaking.' The speaker's expectation is that his/her hearer is there the whole time asking questions mentally (and then?/what for?/etc.) in an increasing order of importance. The flow of talk is expected to be on the build-up towards a climatic moment which is the disclosure of the point. As conversationalists approach this climatic closing, more relevant utterances are produced and the information becomes more and more coherent. If participants share this expectation, they will wait until the end when the statement of the point will wrap

up into one coherent unit all that was said until then. At times, even this explicit statement is dispensable, because the point becomes gradually self-evident.

Interestingly enough, this need for background information to precede the point is similar to a feature of Indian conversational style described by Gumperz and his associates. Their reports:

Our studies of Indian in-group conversation reveal ... characteristics of Indian rhetorical strategy which operate differently from American English: ... in making an argument, Indian speakers take great care to formulate background for what they're going to say; ... (Gumperz 1982a:149)

There are two reasons why a British speaker encounters special problems in understanding [the Indian English speaker]: (a) ...; (b) the relationship between sentences and parts of sentences is not clear [to the British speaker]. (Mishra 1982:61)

... Beth [the British speaker] ... has problems connecting the arguments and is unable to figure out what the central issue is. (Mishra 1982:70)

5.3 Is it Always Like That?

The discussion above demonstrates that the styles used by Roberto and Harry when making their points in negotiation are very different. While Roberto first established background information to provide evidence in support to his point and then stated that point, Harry first stated his point and then provided the evidence to support it. Whereas Roberto needed a solid foundation on which to base his point, Harry perceived the point as the foundation on which to build his evidence, and thus his argument; he saw no point in Roberto's discourse.

But are the two patterns always present when the two parties are making their points in their arguing tasks? The answer to this question is no. As Tannen (1984a:62) reported about participants'

conversational styles in her study of a Thanksgiving dinner, 'whereas a speaker may not employ a certain strategy in one situation, s/he might well employ it in a different context. Preference for one strategy or another is not absolute, but context-sensitive.'

I have isolated a few instances in the data when the two parties inverted their stylistic choices, i.e. when the Brazilians made a classically formatted point, and when the Americans made an indirect point. These instances, however, demonstrate that a participant's choice to use an unusual pattern (in the participant's style) did not occur at random. As will be shown below, the use of the "foreign" pattern was motivated (as in Tannen's Thanksgiving conversation) by some relevant factor in the interaction.

The contextual constraints that provoked a change in the participants' discourse strategies are presented in the following section. The fact that participants discarded the strategies that are characteristic of their style only when some specific contextual constraint was at work reinforces the claim that the two parties do have different conversational styles.

5.3.1 When the Brazilian uses "the American style"

Three examples will be used here to show under what circumstances Roberto would make his point in a fashion similar to the one used by Harry in the examples above.

The first example comes from the last session of negotiations in the event. After Eduardo had proposed that they establish a quota of 2,500 pieces of each item for orders in 1991, Harry

persistently made a point that he needed ground rules, a formula, in case Amage should exceed this quota. This point was reiterated many times in Harry's classical style. Its repetition put Roberto in a position where he had to find a way to respond to the persistence of Harry's request. After some four or five repetitions of the request for ground rules, Roberto came up with the following:

S41.EG9.L001-12.

- 001 H the point is is.. we have to have the ability.. that if all=
[acc]
- 002 =of a sudden.. uh: a bunch of department stores decides to=
003 =promote one or two of the items, instead of all four.. and the=
004 =quantities start.. exceeding, >I have to have SOME basis.. for=
[signals 'up']
- 005 =knowing.. what is it going to [cost me, if I have [to reorder=
006 R [so: [I suggest-
[raises hand]
- 007 H =over 25 hundred pieces.
- >008 R I suggest something.. to see item by item the difference.. the=
[points to E's notes]
- >009 =percentage.. of your price and our price,.. and we use that.. =
>010 =as the basis.. item by item.
- 011 H <well:, let's- uh why don't [>
012 E [we have () the price.

In the first interview we had, Roberto told me that one of his main concerns when negotiating with Americans was that he felt he had to come up with tentative ways out of problems quickly, or else they would quit negotiating. This metainteractional feeling on Roberto's part seems to be consistent with his attitude in the passage above.

It was the pressure from Harry's persistent repetition of the request for a way out of the problem ("ground rules, a formula") that forced Roberto to be direct and present his point without first establishing background information as a basis. In other words, it was the local pressure and Roberto's fear of a break in conversational involvement that triggered his switch of strategies

from his usual indirect choice to the direct strategy in the passage above.

The other two examples of contextually-constrained strategy switches are similar. Once again, Roberto made his points without having established the usual supporting background information prior to the statement of the point. In both these examples, the points were equivalent to proposals. In both cases these proposals came after silent periods following two different difficult moments in the negotiation.

The first of these stretches followed a heated debate over the price of an item (69528). The debate had faded as a visitor was coming in. Eduardo was out to talk to this visitor, while Roberto, Harry and Charles were silent in the room. Breaking this silence, Roberto asked what items were the three most important for the importers. The elicitation of this background information from the importers served as the basis for his first point in the segment (line 1). Then Roberto implicitly stated his point of dropping one particular item, subsequently supporting it with evidence (lines 5-7) as follows:

TS23.EG10.L001-10.

>001 R I suggest.. why don't we concentrate on these.. three items then?
[standing next to Charles] [points to items displayed against wall]

002 H fine.. well, on the tote you're close, so we might=

003 =as well make /the tote./

004 C yeah. (1.8)

>005 R and as we dropped this, what if we dropped th- because=
[points to case on the floor; moves over to pick up case]

>006 =this.... toomy bag, (5.8) it's not simple to make. (1.8)=
[holds case]

>007 =I mean.. the time that it will take to produce this.

008 H fine, forget about the toomy bag.

>009 R //yeah.//

[drops case on the floor]

010 H forget about the toomy bag... so now just add the tote. (60.0)

Harry overlapped Roberto's turn before Roberto could present

all the evidence. This is again typical both of Harry's and of the New York Jewish conversational style described by Tannen (1981b). Here Roberto communicated his point so expeditiously that he even showed surprise by uttering a quiet "yeah" (line 9).

The next example, though similar to the one above, is a transition between Roberto's usual way of making a point and his less usual contextually constrained strategic choice presented above. Like the example above, the one below followed a break in negotiations and the point was also a proposal. However, this context was slightly different from the ones in the preceding examples. Following Charles first request for clarifications which started the last session of negotiations, Roberto was responding to Charles request by saying the target prices on the attache cases could be met. Roberto started to do this, however, by summoning Harry, and not Charles. And Charles was reluctant to join in. In other words, Harry was avoiding committing himself to conversational involvement, which is essential to the making of a point in Roberto's usual style. This seems to account for Roberto's hybrid strategic choice.

This hybrid character lies in the fact that here Roberto provided more background information (lines 4-5) before implicitly making his point (line 6) than Harry would probably expect. The background information here, however, was still less foregrounded than in his usual style. It seems that Roberto decided to change his strategy in the course of delivering his point-making. He started in the usual fashion. He went on until a moment when he felt the need to switch strategies in the face of Harry's verbal and non-verbal cues of denying the conversational involvement

needed for the making of a point importer-style. This is cued in Roberto's sudden change in rhythm and pitch in line 6: he accelerated the pace and spoke in a higher pitch:

S30.EG11.L001-8.

>001 R listen, Harry, (9.5) uh: (4.1) Kaplan,

[looks at Charles]

>002 H I'm listening, I'm very tired I was up all night. (1.1)=
[still, head on table] [raises head quickly]

003 =but I'm listening.

[head on table again]

{acc}

>004 R Alright. Now these two attaches, ok? (1.7) I feel we're=
 (facing Charles) [dec]

```
>005      =gonna get close on this (1.4)  but to confirm. .  a=
[acc]                                     [acc]
```

>006 =100 %.. let's say that basically that price.. is=

>007 =gonna be workable.

008 C uh huh. (1.2)

After Charles signaled some conversational involvement (line 8), Roberto rephrased his previous utterances in the usual fashion of establishing background information (lines 11-16) that would culminate in the statement of the point (lines 17-18).

S30.EG12.L008-21.

009 R but just to confirm, you know.. and firm.... a final price=

010 =which would.. you know, last for next year... alright,=

011 =would last for 25 hundred pieces of each item. (1.3) I'm I'm=

>012 =going down.. to: Buenos Aires next week... to Argentina,=
[dec to end of turn]

>013 =ok?... so if we could- we are going down, so if we can (2.1)=

014 =get this guy.. to accept.. you know, the price that we're=

015 =talking now,... for.. a lot.. let's say, 25 hundred pieces..=

>016 =of each... s- you know,.. item... so if he.. confirms..=

>017 =that price (2.0) then.. we would feel confident, and we'll=

>018 =we'll confirm..=definitely, you know, this price. (1.7)

Q that's on the: on the leather. is that what you're=

>020 =talking about?

021 R yes.

Charles question (lines 19-20) was revealing of the hybrid character of the example of point-making above. He could understand it, but he was not entirely sure he had perceived Roberto's intent correctly, thus the need for the 'formulating' (Dore and McDermott 1982:387), or monitoring (Francis 1986:58) device in lines 19-20.

The examples above are important for two reasons. First, they indicate that Roberto may make points in the classical fashion typical of Harry's style, thus reinforcing the statement made above that the strategy used by the importers is not entirely foreign to the Brazilian manufacturers. The second aspect is that the examples above corroborate the consistency of the claim that Roberto and Eduardo's way of making a point is a stylistic convention within their tradition.

Examples like the ones above were not abundant; they were the exception rather than the rule, and they occurred in specific contexts which caused the participants to switch to a different strategy.

5.3.2 When the American uses "the Brazilian style"

The counterpart of the examples above in the American side of the table also occurred within a specific context. I was able to spot one single instance when Harry made a long series of remarks which apparently had no local topical coherence. He talked about the Czechoslovakians who had quoted him the prices that Courofatos had not been, until that point, able to match:

S15.EG13.L010-17.

010 C nuh, something is wrong.

011 H let me tell you something... and.. / (you en-)/ I hope you=
[hand in the air] [dec]

012 =believe what I'm saying... but the Czechoslovakians are SO:..=

013 =precise... ok? (2.3) and.. there was no flexibility whatsoever=

014 =when they gave us the price.... they said.. [this is the price.

[pounds table]

[that's it.

015 C

016 H [cause one thing- one thing about the Czechoslovakians=

017 C [they (walked) away.

One could think that Harry's point was to say that the Czechoslovakians are precise. However, if we look at the segment

from which the example above was taken in its entirety, we see it differently. The statement about the Czechoslovakians was a (sub-)point that served as support for the real point that would only come much later.

Harry went on to substantiate his sub-point by giving a number of details about the Czechoslovakians, and by telling a couple of anecdotes. Some lines down we can start seeing that his intent was to say more than simply state a feature of Czechoslovakian nature.

S15.EG14.L035-42.

035 H =you'll get it. and checking with other people.. that buy=
 036 =from Czechoslovakia, and Vramden brought us there, and Mr=
 037 C [yeah.
 038 H =Vramden.. (he says) whatever they tell you, you can believe=
 (dec)
 >039 =one hundred per cent. out of all the Eastern bloc countries,=
 >040 C [yeah.
 >041 H =the Czechs.. are the most honourable people of all of them. =
 >042 =/when they tell you something, you can believe it. / 7

Another anecdote followed, and then Harry formulated why he was talking about the Czechoslovakians. Despite the fact that he said "the point is..." (line 59), what follows (lines 60-64) was just another background information sub-point:

S15.EG15.L059-64.

>059 H it'll be three weeks. (2.4) so, (4.4) the point is the=
 (eyebrows up) (puts glasses on)
 >060 =only reason in all honesty why we came here with these=
 (dec)
 061 =samples.. is no matter how much they try to match... it=
 062 =will never have the same exact feel... /it's impossible./=
 063 =and we were told that by a number of tanneries... it'll=
 064 =never be a hundred % the same.

Harry and Charles then supported this particular sub-point with anecdotes. They talked about the price comparison between Brazil and Czechoslovakia. Harry maintained that the prices he had presented as having been quoted from Courofatos' Czechoslovakian competitors were true. This affirmation implied a previous

118 H I have not violated one agreement that I've made,.. but guys,=
119 =come on /I mean/ (1.7) and believe me I did not low-ball you=
>120 =on these prices... these are the true prices.... in fact=
>121 =these prices in reality.. even if you met these prices,=
122 =«Czechoslovakia would still be cheaper, because the ocean=
123 C freight.
124 H =freight is cheaper... «but it's worth it to me..to have=
125 =the whole collection made in one place:... rather than /to=
126 =make some here /and some there..// and ↑I'm going to give=

So, after having put all this in, Harry finally got to the point (lines 143-7) with unusual indirectness:

>137 H they're terrific. . . . so we don't wanna give up that..=
138 =that: uh
139 C [that source, yeah:]
140 H [that contact.
[cigarette in mouth]
141 C yep.
142 H (that's why we're going) right after here we're going to=
>143 =Czechoslovakia. (we're going) (3.0) there has to be something=
>144 =wrong in the calculations. . has to be (1.5) you can't=
~~>145 =tell me that the flap case (1.7) fifty two oh five. . =~~
>147 =58 50 (1.8) there's no way.

Why did Harry have to say that the Czechoslovakians were precise, reliable, terrific, and that the prices he had presented as theirs was true, when what was being negotiated before he introduced the new topic was the price of the 69528? If we look at the beginning and at the end of this segment, we see that the segment as a whole is topically coherent.

S15.EG18.L001-10/L143-7.
L001-10.

>001 E the big problem that we have is in the: 28? ... no? (1.7) yes.
 >002 H the 28 is totally
 [makes a face and nods negatively]
 003 E yes. 28 is=
 004 =totally,-
 [hands on face]

[acc]

>005 H I'm I'm telling you I don't care (1.4) what you're gonna=
>006 =tell me, you can't tell me.. that that item should be.. =
>007 =more than 30%... it's almost 40 %... higher.. you can't=
>008 =you can't convince me.. you can talk all day long about=
>009 =more leather, and more here, and more there;- (2.4)
>010 C nuh, something is wrong.

L143-7.

143 H =Czechoslovakia. (we're going) (3.0) there has to be something=
 >144 =wrong in the calculations.. has to be (1.5) you can't=
 145 =tell me that the flap case (1.7) fifty two oh five..=
 147 =58 50 (1.8) there's no way.

Thus we can also see that Harry's indirect point for the whole passage was double edged. On the one hand there was the message that the prices quoted by Courofatos were wrong, which he stated. On the other hand, by talking about the terrific, precise, and honorable Czechoslovakians, Harry (and Charles) extends the meaning of "wrong" into a metamessage that contrastively puts the two Brazilian manufacturers in a bad light as imprecise and dishonorable.

Thus the reason for this unexpected indirectness in the importers' point-making strategy lies in the fact that the point ~~was indeed a face-threatening act (FTA) in Brown and Levinson's~~ (1978:66/70) terms. Harry and Charles' overall point was an act [an act being what is intended to be done by a verbal or non-verbal communication] that by nature ran 'contrary to the face wants [the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself or herself] of the addressee and/or the speaker.'

The importers could not go bold on-record with this FTA, i.e. deliver it in purely Gricean conformity (Brown and Levinson 1978:99), which is what Harry would have done if he had used his usual strategy of point-making. To threaten the manufacturers positive face (their desire that their self-image be appreciated and approved of) by stating that they were cheating on the price of the item would imply the end of the conversational involvement and the end of negotiations. So it is not difficult to see why Harry and Charles were so unusually indirect in this passage.

Once again, the example above is consistent with the research findings reported here. Harry (and Charles) were shown to be departing from the characteristic pattern of point-making in their tradition due to specifically relevant reasons related to contextual constraints.

The passage presented above has important implications for the following discussion of the clashes between the parties due to their different styles of arguing. Since Harry and Charles diverged from their pattern when their point was potentially face-threatening, they would later assume that also to be the case when Eduardo tried to elicit some background information from them. This would cause misunderstanding of intent, as we will see later.

5.4 Are These Point-Making Styles American and Brazilian?

The two styles presented above represent two distinctive patterns of organizing information in arguing when negotiating. They have come about as the result of participants' socially learned ways to express and interpret meaning in conversation. 'Conversational style is learned through communicative experience, and is therefore influenced by family communicative habits. In other words, conversational style is both a consequence and indicator of ethnicity' (Tannen: 1981a:236).

This is to say that, while the patterns above were identified in the speech of two Brazilians of mostly Portuguese descent and in the speech of two Jewish Americans of Eastern European descent, they may be representative of the two ethnic groups represented to

a lesser or greater degree. As Gumperz, Aulakh and Kaltman (1982:31) put it,

To say that individuals speak Indian or Western conversational English, despite their extensive individual and dialectical variation, that each is a system, means that each has a logical and motivational consistency, a texture, which shapes the universes of features and which we can endeavor to clarify although we do not expect to account for all specific choices. To state the point more succinctly, while not all Indian [or Brazilian or American] speakers will do all or precisely the things of which we give examples, the manner in which stylistic determinants covary in their speech will be the same.

In the next chapter I will show how these two styles conflict, and how this affects the development of the activity of negotiation towards its outcome.

Chapter 6

Communication Problems Due to Different Point-Making Styles

The previous chapter demonstrated that the two parties involved in the negotiation at Courofatos had different styles of organizing information when arguing their points in the interaction. This difference was argued to be a part of each speaker's ethnic identity as well as a signal of this very same ethnic identity. This implies that participants will interpret others' utterances according to the expectations set by their own stylistic conventions. According to Gumperz (1982a:170-1),

Interpretation ... requires first of all judgements of expectedness and then a ^{basic} search for an interpretation that makes sense in terms of what we know from past experience and ~~what we have perceived. ... To decide on an interpretation,~~ participants must first make a preliminary interpretation. That is, they listen to speech, form a hypothesis about what routine is being enacted, and then rely on social background knowledge and on co-occurrence expectations to evaluate what is intended and what attitudes are conveyed.

In this chapter I examine four types of communication problems that occurred in the negotiation at Courofatos. These problems were due to differences in point-making styles, since the two styles generated unshared expectations concerning the interpretation of communicative intent. I will also show that the problems created rather uncomfortable moments, which had a negative effect on the ^{relatively} smooth flow of the negotiation.

Sometimes strains in a conversation reflect real differences between people: they are angry at each other; they really are at cross-purposes. ... But sometimes strains and kinks develop when there really are no basic differences of opinion, when everyone is sincerely trying to get along. This is the type of miscommunication that drives people crazy. And it is usually caused by differences in conversational style. (Tannen 1986a:19)

The examples to be discussed below are also examples of this type of conversational strain.

6.1 Expectations of What a Point Must Be Like

A distinctive feature of negotiation is that in this genre of talk topical coherence must be accomplished locally (Francis 1986). This makes the relevance of a topic more important than its consistency. In other words, it is preferable for an utterance to be connected to what was said before than for it to be consistent with what was said by the same participant at other points in the conversation.

The fact that Harry and Charles stated their point and then provided evidence to support it indicates that they expected to ~~hear their Brazilian suppliers' points in the same format.~~ That is to say they would interpret utterances as tied together as a point in arguing *if* these utterances were patterned similarly to the way they themselves patterned their own utterances.

According to Dore and McDermott (1982:396):

... utterance organization and interpretation are interactional phenomena that are most completely analysed in terms of what many persons, both speakers and listeners, accomplish with them ... however arranged, utterances must be understood in terms of their consequences across persons, in terms of the contextual work by which people arrange their time together.

Therefore, when Roberto or Eduardo built up a whole lot of background information to support the point which would eventually close their turn, Harry and Charles had difficulty seeing the connection between the bits of information they were receiving. For the two American importers, the information that the Brazilian manufacturers provided did not always make sense at first. They

should concentrate, and wait until the end of the exporters' reasoning, to put the information together and then respond to it. This is what the Brazilian manufacturers expected them to do.

The problem was that Harry and Charles did not usually fulfill Roberto and Eduardo's expectation. Many times they did not wait for the end of the turns, and even when they did, some times they simply did not interpret their Brazilian interlocutors' utterances as points, or as the performance of an arguing task.

This is what Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982b:150) observed in their analysis of committee negotiations involving Britishers and West Indians:

... the qualities of talk that make an argument appear to be reasoned are not the propositional units as such, but in large part stylistic features of the order, structure, and ways that linkages are created between propositional segments. ~~So what in one cultural tradition sounds like a~~ reasoned argument may not appear as such in another.

The result of this is that from Harry and Charles' perspective, Eduardo and Roberto's utterances sounded confusing, irrelevant, or, what is worse, incoherent. When discussing coherence in non-native speech, Odlin (1989:58) stresses the potential for misunderstandings to arise when individuals do not share expectations about coherence in discourse. He refers to some cases when listeners see conversation as incoherent because it appears to them to be little relation between focus of information and background information. He refers to some cases when

... audiences may not have problems with the content of discourse but with the presentation of information. For audiences unfamiliar with certain patterns of organization, the information presented through those patterns may prove difficult or even impossible to understand.

This is, on the one hand, Harry and Charles' case when they tried to make sense of their Brazilian suppliers' arguing tasks.

On the other hand, however, Roberto and Eduardo did not have much problem understanding Harry's and Charles' utterances as a point. Three factors may explain this. First, Harry's utterances are many times lexically signalled as the introduction of a point, for example "I have a proposal," "This is the bottom line:," "This is my offer:," and so on. Second, Brazilians are used to hearing and reading information formatted according to the principles of Aristotelian rhetoric in various genres of texts within various contexts. As was shown in the previous section, Roberto will even make points in Harry's fashion if pressed to. Third and perhaps most important here, the two Brazilians are the ones who speak English as a second language and have been exposed to Harry and Charles' format before, in positions where they were the learners; ~~Harry and Charles have their own convention as the only basis of~~ their expectations.

The differences in the two styles did not always develop into problems of communication. Sometimes they came into contact quite smoothly, as in some of the examples presented. Some other times, however, they did unfold into communication problems.

These problems fall into two basic categories. The first category includes those moments when there was a lack of communication of intent (points were not interpreted as such). This may or may not have produced negative consequences. The second category includes those moments when there was miscommunication of intent, and this is really disastrous both locally and to the outcome of the whole event.

Since we have already seen what the styles are like in contexts when they did not present particular problems, we will

B

elicitation of the Brazilian point

↓

1

other. Among these bits of information we expect some form of the statement of a point. However, as we listen, we are not sure there is a connection between or among those bits of information, we are not sure there is a point at all. And yet, we believe there must be a point there, or else our business friends would not be talking to us about such things. So what we do is we try to guess what the point is by formulating it.

According to Dore and McDermott (1982:396) 'formulating occurs when members claim, describe, or suggest a version of what they are doing together.' This seems to be what Charles and Harry were trying to do in order to make sense of what was going on. As Tannen (1981a:226) puts it:

To the listener, a misunderstanding is indistinguishable from an understanding. One commits to an interpretation and proceeds to fit succeeding information into that mold. People will put up with a great deal of seemingly inappropriate verbal behavior before questioning the line of interpretation which seems self-evident.

Tannen (1984a:122) also points out that it is typical of the New York Jewish conversational style (hers as well) 'to supply a point if someone does not provide one when [she] expects them to.' Therefore Harry and Charles were only being consistent with their style by trying to guess what Eduardo or Roberto's point was.

From the Brazilian manufacturers' standpoint, however, the importers successive attempts at formulating were seen as interruptions. These attempts prevented them from establishing the necessary background information to support their point, which was yet to come. While trying to build up towards point disclosure, Roberto or Eduardo had to stop their current statement in order to deny the incorrect guesses made by the American interlocutors about what the point was. This not only delayed their

point-making, but it also created a frustrating feeling of not communicating their intent time after time.

Interestingly enough, this is also what happened to Sally, the non-New Yorker participant in the Thanksgiving dinner analyzed by Tannen (1984a). Tannen reports that:

It is consistently difficult for her to pursue a topic until her complete thought is out, and it is difficult for Peter and for me [Jewish New Yorkers] to figure out what her main point is. ... During playback Sally said she could not understand why Peter kept interrupting her story to question her about irrelevant details. ... The reason for them was that Peter and I had not understood the point of her story - indeed missed the fact that she had not gotten to the point yet -

If we look more closely at the example presented above, we have Roberto trying to make a point about the importance of quoting two different prices depending on whether they used Brazilian or Argentinian leather. The point was that they would have to plan a special long-term shipping schedule if Courofatos used Argentinian leather.

There was silence before Roberto started talking. He was starting to introduce the topic - buying this leather from Argentina (line 1) -, but when he was ready to start providing the basis for his point (line 2), Charles tried his first guess, which, though apparently correct at first, was soon found to be incorrect.

S13.EG2.L001-9.

>001 R oh and one more thing... buying this leather from Argentina,=
 >002 =we're gonna.. you know, need to plan.. a kind of uh:
 003 C [uh] =
 >004 =advance./
 >005 R in advance, ok. as soon as we get your orders for instance,=
 >006 =we have to schedule with Argentina deliveries. (1.5)
 >007 C oh, you're not gonna schedule before that? before=
 >008 =you get our orders?
 >009 R no, sure, what I'm trying to say is

Roberto took Charles' overlapping comment (lines 3-4) as a

contribution to his point-making and started building up the supporting background information to his point (line 5). He did not say that a special schedule (was what) had to be planned in advance, and he did not signal that the routine he would describe was hypothetical. He only described a hypothetical routine in case they used Argentinian leather from the very beginning: (if they proceeded as usual, i.e. without a long-term schedule for orders) Courofatos would get an order from Amage. Only then would they order the specific cuttings from Argentina according to that order. So the cuttings would take some time to get to the factory in Brazil, and the shipment of the finished products to Amage would take very long. Therefore (the point was) they should come up with a schedule for orders to go through in case the deal with ~~Argentina actually worked out as they wanted.~~

The problem was that Charles expected the point to come in the beginning. So before Roberto had gotten to his actual point, Charles was trying to figure out what Roberto's point had been. Since Roberto's initial (background) information was the only thing he could take as a point, Charles had to interpret it as such. What he heard as the point then was that Courofatos would only schedule orders of leather from Argentina after Amage placed an actual order of x pieces of item y.

This sounded unreasonable to Charles so he interrupted again in line 7. At this point Roberto realized that Charles' first overlap meant that Charles had not really understood what Roberto had meant by "in advance."

When trying to restart his point-making, Roberto was interrupted again:

S13.EG3.L007-15.

007 C oh, you're not gonna schedule before that? before=
 008 =you get our orders?
 >009 R a no, sure, what I'm trying to say is
 >010 H [we'll work on this=
 >011 =today. /I have no problem with that. /
 >012 R [you know, what I'm trying=
 >013 =to say is.. uh if.. for instance... if you place orders=
 >014 =today, you cannot expect... shipment in two weeks. (1.6)
 >015 H [makes face by frowning and wrinkling eyes and cheeks]

This time it was Harry (line 10), who had also taken Roberto's background information as the point. Harry understood Roberto to be saying they would have to schedule future shippings, which is their normal procedure once prices have been set. Like Charles, Harry had not perceived the hypotheticality of Roberto's anecdote.

Still, Roberto went on to try and make his point. His new attempt was an immediate contradiction of Harry's previous interpretation (lines 12-15).

~~At this point both American importers had unsuccessfully~~
 tried to make sense of Roberto's background information as a point. Roberto was also frustrated for not having communicated his intent. The problem continued:

S13.EG4.L016-39.

>016 R I mean s- - a NO something like.. we would do if ↑nuh nuh nuh.
 017 H [we'll=
 018 =start shipping in December.
 >019 R no, I'm not talking about the new line. I'm talking=
 020 =about you know, after production is running (2.2) what=
 021 =I'm trying to say is uh!.. =
 >022 C you're talking about a ()
 >023 R [if if in ↑March.. no if in=
 024 =March, when this is gonna be part of.. production, ok?
 (holds case)
 >025 C ah, alright.
 026 R so if in March, [you place an order,
 >027 H [this has got to be a part of=
 028 =production before March. (4.9) this is gonna be in January.
 >029 R ok, so let's say within March you place orders for the.. =
 030 =fifth quarter.. for instance,
 >031 H right.
 >032 R so if you place an order in March first,.. we cannot deliver.. =
 033 =in March 15.. as if we would.. for instance.. if we had stock=
 034 =in inventory here that we could cut, and [ship to you.)
 >035 H [↑but you must have=

036 =some inventory that you're going to develop here? you can't-
 >037 R [yeah=
 038 =but- we're gonna keep some inventory of leather but.. but not=
 039 =huge quantities. the bulk of of your orders are gonna be..=

It took Roberto quite some time to get the two American importers to see that he was trying to establish a hypothetical situation as the basis for his point. Harry and Charles kept taking his hypothetical anecdote as the point itself. In line 16, Roberto denied Harry's interpretation of his intent. In line 19, he tried to reestablish the topic, this time by restricting it a bit:

S13.EG5.L019-21.

>019 R no, I'm not talking about the new line. I'm talking=
 020 =about you know, after production is running (2.2) what=
 021 =I'm trying to say is uh..=

Charles tried to formulate once again (line 22), but this time Roberto overlapped with him and tried to establish the hypotheticality of his anecdote (line 23):

S13.EG6.L022-8.

>022 C you're talking about a [if if in March.. no if in=
 >023 R [if if in March.. no if in=
 024 =March, when this is gonna be part of.. production, ok?
 [holds case]
 >025 C ah, alright.
 >026 R so if in March, [you place an order,
 >027 H [this has got to be a part of=
 028 =production before March. (1.3) this is gonna be in January.

Charles finally managed to interpret the hypothetical quality of the information provided by Roberto (lines 23-24). In line 25, his "ah, alright" reveals his perception.

But Harry had not perceived it yet; he was still trying to make sense of what Roberto was saying as if that was the point. In line 27, Harry overlapped with Roberto's new attempt to get to the point. He saw as an absurdity Roberto's talk about a (first) order in March when Harry expected shipments (of finished products) in January. So Roberto had to make sure that Harry too would perceive

the hypothetical character of the information he was (unsuccessfully) trying to establish as a basis for his point.

S13.EG7.L29-34.

>029 R ok, so let's say within March you place orders for=
 >030 =the.. fifth quarter.. for instance,
 >031 H right.
 >032 R so if you place an order in March first,.. we cannot deliver.. =
 033 =in March 15.. as if we would.. for instance.. if we had stock=
 034 =in inventory here that we could cut, and ship to you.)

Roberto's "ok" (line 29) is revealing of his frustration. He seemed to be saying "oh well, I thought I had got this straight, but I was wrong, let's try again." And this time he managed to get Harry to see that the order he had been talking about was a hypothetical (but essential) bit of information for the making of his point; that the hypothetical order was not the point itself. So in line 32 Roberto finally got his background information established. Harry still needed some clarifications, which Roberto provided.

S13.EG8.L032-34.

>032 R so if you place an order in March first,.. we cannot deliver.. =
 033 =in March 15.. as if we would.. for instance.. if we had stock=
 034 =in inventory here that we could cut, and ship to you.)

Once Harry and Charles both understood Roberto's background information as such, that is, once Roberto had finally managed to get to the moment of disclosing his point, it was Harry himself, and not Roberto, who stated it.

S13.EG9.L037-44.

037 R Lyeah=
 038 =but- we're gonna keep some inventory of leather but.. but not=
 039 =huge quantities. the bulk of of your orders are gonna be.. =
 040 = [] and cut.
 >041 H [so how much lean time how much lean time do you need?
 >042 R uh:: they asked uh a mon- uh four weeks, you know, from=
 043 =the moment we place order.. within four mon- four weeks.. =
 044 =or one month, they would be shipping to us.

Harry overlapped with Roberto and asked a question. This question (line 41) and its adjacent answer (lines 42-4) were the point that Roberto had been trying to get to all along this

stretch of talk. Thus the point was actually elicited by Harry and Charles, and finally made jointly by Harry, Charles and Roberto.

Harry responded to the disclosure of the point by taking it as routine, apparently not worth all the fuss (line 41). Nevertheless, Roberto still went on with the same background information that he had had in mind in order to get to his statement of the point, but which he had not yet delivered:

S13.EG10.L045-50.

>045 H ok. so you give us the ground rules of what we have to do, so=

>046 =that we know how to place our orders. //that's no problem.//

>047 R Ok, because at the moment when we place orders in Argentina=

048 =after four weeks they'll be ready to ship... requested=

049 =quantities.. two thousand pieces, three thousand pieces. (1.8)=

050 =so when it gets here then we're gonna finish.. the product. (4.8)

(pounding table)

051 C [nods affirmatively]

052 H - (writing again)

053 C () be sure they ship all the parts at one time.

054 R yes. yes. sure... gotta be complete sets.

055 Н уер.

Roberto was again a bit startled with the development of the exchange. His rephrasing of the point sounded as if he was talking to himself (lines 47-50). He spoke while the two importers were silently writing down notes. This embarrassing scene can be pictured especially in line 50 above. A long pause (4.8") follows Roberto's restatement of the point which Harry and Charles had already previously elicited from him.

The example above presents the first type of the communication problems - the American elicitation of the Brazilian point before it is ripe - caused by the participants' different discourse strategies. While it definitely brought frustration and a feeling of not communicating to all participants, this kind of problem was not the most disruptive because, after all, Roberto's intent was eventually communicated.

Still, if Harry and Charles had been aware of a specific feature of Roberto's conversational style, his need to establish some ground for the making of a point, it seemed that the uncomfortable feelings which arose in the segment above could have been avoided. By the same token, had Roberto been aware of Harry and Charles' expectations as far as point-making was concerned, he could have saved some time and energy (and face) by at least stressing the hypothetical character of his introductory anecdote in the beginning.

Let us now look at more disruptive types of uncomfortable moments created by the different speech and contextualization conventions.

~~6.2.2—"You never explained that!"—Intent not communicated~~

The second type of communication problem is more serious than the first. If the one discussed above meant frustration and a feeling of not communicating smoothly, the examples below meant actual lack of communication of intent. In the following passages, the Brazilian manufacturer's point were never made, since the American importers never took their intent as a point.

A few contextual subsidies are necessary for the understanding of the following example. The point that Eduardo and Roberto tried to make in the excerpt below had to do with the fact that they had not yet solved their leather supply dilemma.

Courofatos was on the verge of striking a deal with a new Argentinian supplier. If this came through as planned, they would be able to buy cuttings of leather ready to be assembled for much cheaper than they would pay for whole panels of leather in Brazil

(which they would have to cut). In addition, if they could buy leather from Argentina to sell finished items to the United States, they would be buying and selling in US dollars, which they saw as an advantage. The problem was that the deal was still hanging in the air, and they had never dealt with the people in the Argentinian tannery, so Eduardo was not confident that the Argentinians would keep their prices.

Thus they find themselves in a dilemma. On the one hand, Roberto and Eduardo would really love to be able to quote prices based on Argentinian leather. This would allow Courofatos to have more competitive prices, in addition to being administratively convenient. On the other hand, however, they could not risk quoting prices that they would not be able to honor if the deal ~~with the Argentinian tannery failed; they could only figure~~ definitive prices based on the very expensive domestic leather which was their only reliable source. So they figured prices both ways.

S7.EG11.L001-19.

[acc]

001 H first of all, what was the original price you gave me=
 002 =on the uh.. 6 9 5 3 6?
 003 C three- three four.
 004 R [right.] no wait a minute.
 005 H 6 9 5 3 6.
 006 C 3 6?
 007 E this number, here. (2.0)
 008 R /right. yeah. / (1.8) 55 94... that was the first. (4.9)
 >009 E /if we buy from Argentina,/ the cuttings, how much it costs?
 010 H and that's FOB, is that correct?
 >011 R yeah. (2.2) now we're uh... we're setting two... ways ok?=
 012 [ok.
 >013 =one if we buy the cuttings from Argentina, (1.4) and one=
 >014 =if (1.5) uh: we buy the cuttings in Bra- we- if we cut here=
 >015 =in Brazil, you know, if we buy leather and pay in Brazil,=
 >016 =(1.8) and we're getting uh better prices in Argentina at=
 >017 =this moment.... not at this moment but we figure that=
 >018 =for 1991, we better off buy in dollars and sell in dollars.
 >019 H [nods affirmatively a number of times showing annoyance]

In the passage above, when they were about to quote prices on the second item to be negotiated, Eduardo reminded Roberto that they should also quote the potential Argentinian leather price (line 9). Before doing that, Roberto wanted to make sure the two American importers understood there was an unusual procedure going on: quoting two prices on the same exact item. Thus when he informed the importers of the reason for the two prices, Roberto was simply trying to make a point of introducing to them the unusual price quoting procedure. If they did not ask why, it would be ok, because this would only eventually become relevant.

Roberto formatted his point-making in the usual exporter style. Without introducing it lexically, he gave bits of information that would lead to the point (lines 11-19), provided ~~the interlocutor waited until the end and was involved in trying~~ to understand it as a point. He was apparently successful, since Harry nodded affirmatively (line 19).

S7.EG12.L011-19.

>011 R yeah. (2.2) now we're uh... we're setting two... ways ok?=
012 ok.

>013 =one if we buy the cuttings from Argentina, (1.4) and one=
>014 =if (1.5) uh: we buy the cuttings in Bra- ve- if we cut here=
>015 =in Brazil, you know, if we buy leather and pay in Brazil,=
>016 =(1.8) and we're getting uh better prices in Argentina at=
>017 =this moment.... not at this moment but we figure that=
>018 =for 1991, we better off buy in dollars and sell in dollars.
>019 H (nods affirmatively a number of times showing annoyance)

The point Roberto felt he had made in lines 11-18 was that he had introduced the importers to the unusual price quoting procedure; that there would be two prices for each item. He did not say that the following remarks would not be immediately connected with Harry and Charles' concern at that point, which was to make sure the price that had been quoted belonged to the right item (69536=US\$55.94).

Roberto expected that Harry and Charles would see that, as a whole, his remarks were coherent with the previous topic (reviewing the quoted price). Their different styles entailed different expectations of format for interpretation. So when Eduardo prompted Roberto to quote the Argentinian leather price (line 9), and Roberto set out to inform of the unusual procedure by saying "we're setting two ways" (line 11), Harry and Charles had no way of telling that that was the beginning of an important point in the negotiation. They heard all that, and could not make much sense of the information. That was why Harry nodded affirmatively a number of times in line 19: he was annoyed because what he was hearing sounded irrelevant.

Throughout the event Harry repeated quite a few times that it ~~was not his concern where his suppliers got their raw material as~~ long as the price of the item was right. So he tried in vain to figure out why the manufacturers were telling him about the difference between the price of leather in Brazil and in Argentina, right after he had been quoted "outrageous" prices on the new items. This will become evident in the next segment.

The equivocal result of this was that Eduardo and Roberto felt they had been successful in making a point that would be important later on when they settled the deal. For them, this is "the right way to do business:" first you set all the pieces on the table, and then you start to play. For the time being all they wanted to communicate was that there was an unusual procedure in quoting prices because of their dilemma.

However, what was tragic was that Harry and Charles had not interpreted their utterances as a point of any sort. To the

American importers, there was just the recollection that two prices were being quoted. And yet, in Harry and Charles' terms this would not be the way to do business. They assumed that if you quoted two prices on the same item, you would want the two prices to be used, and this would be absurd.

But they did not react to this point because they had not seen any point. They simply agreed with Roberto. Harry's affirmative nods (line 19 above) terminated the exchange and were followed by a long pause (26"). It was only later, when they figured there must be a reason for the two prices, that they reacted.

The evidence to all this comes from a segment occurring five hours later. Harry and Charles had been hearing two prices for every item discussed. There was a pause in talks because the ~~making of a new sample was delayed and Eduardo was out. So Charles~~ and Harry were writing notes when all of a sudden Harry asked Roberto a question:

S12.EG13.L001-7.

>001 H let me ask you a question.... why are you quoting prices=
 >002 =from Brazil and Argentina? (3.6) you know I'm not gonna=
 >003 R [looking down onto table, shoulders drooping over table]
 004 H =buy... I I I don't wanna buy it from Brazil (1.2) I=
 005 C [can't buy it with two prices.]
 >006 H =wanna buy it on the basis of the prices from Argentina...=
 >007 =then why are you quoting.. two ways? (1.8)

By asking the question in tandem (cf. lines 1-5), Harry and Charles demonstrated that the Brazilian party had actually not made the point about the unusual pricing procedure. Even though the Brazilians had had all the evidence to believe that they had made the point of establishing the need for the two prices from Harry's affirmative nods (transcribed in the previous example), Roberto now realized they had misinterpreted those nods. In other words, intent had been miscommunicated in that stretch.

The example above reveals a moment of intense discomfort for Roberto. He signaled that non-verbally in line 3, where he seemed at once disappointed, frustrated and ashamed (looking down, shoulders drooping). This continued in the next example.

TS12.EG14.L008-24.

008 R we're just uh: you know.. showing you in a in a fair=
> [eyebrows up; making repated movements with hands as gate
 opening]
009 =and clear way... I mean the cost if ve buy from Brazil,=
010 =domestic leather is gonna be this()
>011 H [but I gotta be crazy=
>012 =to buy it from Brazil (1.8) () isn't that true? (1.7)
>013 R ve always uh you know, what we're trying to do is we're=
014 =trying to show it... you know,=
>015 C =they're trying to show [us everything.
>016 H [//let me ask you a=
 [nods negatively]
017 =question.// if you were sitting here,
018 R right.
019 H somebody quotes you fif- thirty four ten from Argentina,=
020 =and 36 10 from Brazil, (1.4) quality of leather is=
021 =equal,... which would you xbuy from? (1.8)
022 R xArgentina.
 [~~moves head to the right and down over shoulder~~]
023 H [right, so why would you I even consider Brazil?
024 C [of course.

Roberto's attempt at answering Harry's question would only reinforce the remark above about his uneasiness. Charles and Harry put him in a position where he appeared to be an unreasonable child among knowledgeable grown-ups (lines 11-24).

Roberto tried to answer the question, but he had a hard time finding the words: he was very uncomfortable. This is clear from his hesitations and by the non-verbal cues he sent. Fillers like "uh:", pauses, stutters -"in a in a in a fair..."- (line 8), as well as hedgings and repetitions (lines 13 and 14) are examples that reveal Roberto's discomfort.

Still, Roberto was reaffirming the intended metamessage of his previous point, which he had meant as a signal of honesty and rapport. He explicitly stated this now, by saying (line 8) "we're

showing you in a fair clear way...". They were showing the importers that they were trying to find a way to reduce costs in order to sell products more competitively. They were responding to the importers' persistent urge for friendly cooperation, only in ways that Harry and Charles did not see as signals of cooperation.

The clash in conversational styles also forced another difference between the two parties to come to surface. Harry responded to Roberto's answer by stating his view of "the right way to do business."

S12.EG15.L011-2.

>011 H

But I gotta be crazy=

>012 =to buy it from Brazil (1.8) () isn't that true? (1.7)

This view is contrary to Eduardo's "right way (of doing business)" discussed above. While Harry was concerned with playing the game right away, Eduardo felt that first the pieces must be laid on the table, and the rules must be discussed. While Eduardo felt every player had to prove that he did not have anything up the sleeve, Harry felt that this would eventually surface if it happened to be relevant to the deal.

Following the above remark by Harry, Roberto just reaffirmed his viewpoint:

S12.EG16.L013-5.

013 R we always uh you know, what we're trying to do is we're=

014 =trying to show it... you know,=

015 C =they're trying to show us everything.

Charles' reaction to his reiteration of that viewpoint reveals the very argument of this study. To him, the Brazilians' cherished style in providing background information for every point was useless (and therefore nonsensical). The clash led to a rather embarrassing interaction segment as Harry took Roberto on a Socratic dialogue towards an eminent face-loss.

S12.EG17.L016-24.

- >016 H L//let me ask you a=
- [nods negatively]
- >017 =question. // if you were sitting here,
- >018 R right.
- >019 H somebody quotes you fif- thirty four ten from Argentina,=
- >020 =and 36 10 from Brazil, (1.4) quality of leather is=
- >021 =equal,... which would you buy from? (1.8)
- >022 R Argentina.
- [moves head to the right and down over shoulder]
- >023 H right, so why would you I even consider Brazil?
- 024 C Of course.

This eminent loss of face did not interest any of the partners. Thus it is understandable why the subject was abruptly dropped by everyone without any further attempts at returning to it. The following example shows a (fortunate) break in the frame brought about by Courofatos' domestic sales manager:

S12.EG18.L024-36.

- >Almir (domestic sales manager) comes in
- 025 R Lthis... this=
- 026 =is gonna involve the standby letter of credit,...
- 027 C but we've agreed to it=
- 028 R =right, ok.
- 029 H We've agreed to it.
- >Almir bangs noisy air conditioner
- >030 H what are you doing?
- > [moves head to the left and right 3 times]
- 031 Almir tem que ser na porrada /mesmo/.
- >032 R it quiet down.
- [laughs]
- >033 C yeah.
- 034 Almir melhorou?
- 035 H (a word in a foreign language)
- >036 C right... that's why he banged it.

He came in the room and banged the air-conditioner so that it would stop reverberating. The noise was loud, and all three negotiators readily shifted the uncomfortable frame they had built to comment on the incident (lines 30-36).

The above discussion shows that the participants' different conversational styles can clash when intent that had not been communicated was later called for in the negotiation. While the Brazilians felt they had made their point right from the start and

were being extraordinarily fair, the Americans felt they were being given useless information. While the Americans felt their suppliers were being senselessly unreasonable, the Brazilians felt their customers were being unreasonably inconsiderate.

A further example of this problem comes from a moment of decisive change in the negotiation when Eduardo tried to explain a proposal. This proposal would ultimately settle the business. Eduardo had been doing some calculations for a long time while Harry, Charles, Roberto and I were engaged in small talk about Harry and Charles' business trips to various places. Eduardo asked in a kidding tone whether they were ready to "speak serious."

His proposal was based upon a piece of background information he had elicited from Harry some 30 minutes before. He had asked ~~Harry how many pieces Harry expected to order per item throughout~~ the upcoming year. Using Harry's figures, Eduardo proposed that the Americans buy that set number of items and advance the money for Courofatos to buy the leather to be consumed. Then Courofatos would sell the items at Amage's target prices. This proposal developed until they struck a deal concerning the new collection.

Eduardo started explaining his plan. He based his explanation on the information collected from Harry, as if Harry knew that the information he had provided earlier was going to end up in a point.

S37.EG19.L001-14.

001 E ok, my projection.. was.. the following, (1.8) uh (2.8) 10=
 002 =thousand pieces.... 2 thousand.. 5 hundred of each.=
 003 =(1.4) you know, if you maintain.. these right quantities,=
 004 =ok?... then I made.. the.. medium.. of price.. that you want=
 005 =to pay, is \$ 39 40... in these 4... styles. (1.8) ok? (1.2)
 006 C the average price?
 007 E yes, average price.
 008 C /that's what he's saying... on the ten thousand./
 009 E you buy.. two tuh- 2 thousand 5 hundred of each... 34,=

010 =36, 24 and 28. 35.. out. ok? (1.9) and then.. you price is \$39=
 011 =40, and our price is about \$ 44.... 27. (2.8) understand it?
 012 H no.
 013 C no. (1.9)
 [acc]
 014 R wait a minute. (9.8)

[two paralel floors emerge until Roberto tries to explain again]

This time Harry and Charles knew that there was a point in what Eduardo was saying, and they figured it had to be important. This segment comes from the last session of the event. It was mid-morning, and they would have to leave before noon. After calculating for about half an hour, Eduardo said he had a projection, meaning a proposal (line 1): Harry and Charles listened attentively, but they still could not make sense of the information. Despite the fact that they expected a point, they could not see it.

Eduardo said he had made a projection (line 1): Harry said he would order 2,500 pieces per style (line 2), and there were four styles (line 5), which meant that Amage would order 10,000 pieces (line 1). The average target prices set by Harry for those four items was US\$39.40 (lines 4-5).

By providing all these data, Eduardo was, again, "doing business the right way." He was showing the importers what had been the course of his reasoning before he came to the proposal. So he asked the importers whether they had followed that course in order to then disclose his point:

S37.EG20.L009-11.

009 E you buy.. two tuh- 2 thousand 5 hundred of each... 34,=
 010 =36, 24 and 28. 35.. out. ok? (1.9) and then.. you price is \$39=
 >011 =40, and our price is about \$ 44.... 27. (2.8) understand it?

The two importers were eager to see what he had gotten out of all those calculations, they were expecting the announcement of a proposal, its explanation and some supporting evidence that it

would indeed solve their problem. And yet, despite their effort to find all this in Eduardo's utterances, they could not see what the point was, simply because that was not Eduardo's point.

They heard Eduardo saying he had averaged the target prices and added up Harry's projections of orders for the new items, but what did that mean? So when Eduardo asked if they had followed his line of reasoning for the establishment of the background information that should come before the point, Harry and Charles thought he was asking if they had gotten the point, and they had not, so they answered:

S37.EG21.L011-13.

>011 =40, and our price is about \$ 44. . . . 97. (2.8) understand it?

012 H no.

013 C no. (1.9)

Once again we have a lack of communication of intent that was ~~caused by the different expectations of how a point should be~~ organized when you argue in a negotiation. Eduardo asked: "Is this (background information) ok?" Harry and Charles answered: "No (the point is not ok.)."

Although one could argue that Eduardo's understand it? (line 11) could be simply a request for feedback, transferring the Portuguese entende?, the context at that moment makes this supposition very unlikely, for all participants were expecting Eduardo to come up with a solution to their problem. In addition, the long pause that preceded Eduardo's question does not co-occur with the feedback request entende?.

The need for information to gradually unfold itself towards coherence in Eduardo's style can be felt at various levels. At a macro level, it was up to Harry to wait and see why Eduardo had asked how many pieces Amage would order.

At a micro level, as can be seen in this latest example, even the calculation that Eduardo was explaining came in the same format. Various apparent incoherent pieces were thrown in until the moment when they all came together coherently. He did not say $2,500 \times 4 = 10,000$ pieces. He said: 10,000 pieces. The interlocutor should mentally ask: what 10,000 pieces? the answer then follows: you said 2,500 pieces on each item, there are four items, so...

S37.EG22.L001-3.

001 E ok, my projection.. was.. the following, (1.8) uh (2.8) 10=
002 =thousand pieces.... 2 thousand.. 5 hundred of each.=
003 =(1.4) you know, if you maintain.. these right quantities,=

And the puzzle-guessing game should go on towards the point. However, Harry and Charles did not think the game was always worth the time and effort it consumed. Their point-blank responses (lines 12-13) attest to that.

~~Next I will present examples in which Harry and Charles~~
interrupted the two Brazilians before they began to spread out detailed background information. This resulted not only in uncomfortable moments for everyone, but also entailed a significant weakening of the Brazilian party's points.

6.2.3 "Do me a favor: get to the point!" - Interrupted point-making results in poorly supported arguing

The communication problem I will discuss now is the one that most seriously affected the development of the activity negotiation. The problem arises from the basic conflicting expectations I have been discussing. Harry and Charles wanted a clearly stated point which should be subsequently supported. Negotiation would then focus on those supporting elements for the maintenance or modification (or discarding) of the point. Eduardo

and Roberto tended to disappoint them in this respect by introducing background information at various levels before disclosing the point. What often happened in this case was that Harry and Charles interrupted the Brazilians' point-making and demanded the use of a more direct strategy.

The disruptive effect of this on the process of negotiation was tremendous. The interruption curtailed the establishment of information that should support the Brazilian manufacturers' points. Their ability to support their points after these points had been stated was not great. Their arguments thus became fragmented and seemed to be rather unconvincing to the American importers. However, the arguments were not intrinsically weak; they sometimes were unquestionable to the manufacturers. Roberto and Eduardo were as sure they were right as Harry and Charles were sure they were wrong. Despite the American suppliers' protests, they would maintain the points in the argument forever.

Among the four problems, interrupted point-making was the only one in which one of the parties, the Brazilian, was more negatively affected by the difference in conversational styles. While all of the clashes caused frustration, animosity, miscommunication and disruption to conversational cooperation, this case made the Brazilian party appear incoherent, unreasonable and stubborn. The inability to format the evidence to their points (so that the importers would see them as persuasive) led the negotiation to a dead-end.

The examples below all revolved on one particular point: the price is right. Eduardo and Roberto wanted to introduce all the reasons why the price of the item was going to be x, but Harry and

Charles wanted the price itself to come first.

As I have pointed out before, the need to establish background information to a point was so deeply ingrained in the Brazilians that many times they would make a point with the single intent of laying the background for the background information of a more important point. This was the case for the price quoting procedure in the negotiation.

In the segment below Eduardo tried to make a point of communicating his intent to supply the copies of the cost sheets specifying details about the pricing of the item. He did this so that they could discuss the price more precisely. The manufacturers were concerned with setting realistic prices so that they would not have to increase prices later on, since Amage had ~~warned them that they would not get increases again.~~ Eduardo's point here, however, was to propose that they actually use the cost sheets. Harry and Charles were talking about some changes they would like to make in the production of an item while Eduardo had been trying to get the floor:

S4.EG23.L014-22.

014 H yeah.

(looks at Eduardo over his glasses)

015 E /a moment. /my suggestion is the following, ve ve'll work=

016 =as ve told in NY.. very clear.. in price.. ve have to=

017 =begin with the right price (1.3) today.... not to go to=

018 =United States and.. then ve'll see.. together ... the=

019 =price, AI will give you one of this. and then ve'll see=

(shows sheets of paper)

020 =some modification that ve have to make (2.0) to:.... to=

021 =have a better price, understand?

022 H (nods affirmatively)

Harry agreed with what for Eduardo was background information (lines 16-18). He agreed entirely with Eduardo that they had to set definitive prices. But Eduardo's point came after the emphatic then (line 18): "let us use the cost sheets to study price

reductions." Eduardo's question (line 21) aimed at getting agreement for this.

Eduardo restated his point and explicitly referred to the making of the copies for the two American importers (lines 30 and 39-40). They agreed with him, but I suspect that they hardly realized what Eduardo meant by those sheets of paper. The transcription below shows this:

S4.EG24.L024-41.

- 024 E I think that we seeing this,... we can see what we can make=
 025 =uh in:: modifications, you know
 026 C [changes] yeah.
 027 H right.
 [nodes affirmatively, moves chair upward; starts flipping notebook pages]
 028 E it's not good if you make changes now... and we...
 029 H right.
 030 E ok? I will give you one of this, this is.. my list.. I=
 031 C [alright]
 032 E =will see here.. this (1.2) cause if you begin uh to make=
 033 H [writing up notes; looking down]
 034 E ~~=changes then (1.2) with here we (1.4) I will take a copy=~~
 035 =of.. of each and we can see it together, (1.2) ok?
 036 H uh huh.
 037 E we have much time today, (5.5) sssixty 9.. 5.. 2 4?
 038 H no, sixty nine.. five.. three six.
 039 E five three six, ok, first we'll begin with this.... I=
 040 =will take one copy to you too, Charlie.
 041 C ok.

From the segment above it would seem reasonable to assume that all participants had agreed to work on the prices having Courofatos cost sheets as a starting point for negotiation of prices and manufacturing modifications (lines 24-27).

Now let us see what happened when the first price quoting routine was enacted only 8 minutes after the exchange above:

S5.EG25.L001-50.

- 001 H Eduardo
 002 R [ok, now let me explain.. what each... thing here is (1.7)=
 [dec]
 003 =first page, if you.. next page (2.3) couro is leather.
 [looking at cost sheets in H's hands; makes sign with hand meaning an order to turn page]
 004 E [lights a cigarette]
 005 C what's that? (3.2)

006 R leather. (9.8) /ok. / (1.2)
007 E /acho importante dizer que nos tamos com. . prevendo. . =
008 =fazendo o calculo em cima do dolar em 110 cruzeiros. / (2.2)
009 R yeah uh:: ve vanna. . we're uh pricing=
[nods in agreement] [covering face with hand]
[acc]
010 =leather uh dollar at 110 cruzeiros. . here we're using=
011 =official exchange. . of 110 cruzeiros. . . . =
012 H [nods affirmatively]
013 R =/so that's a waste. . of 90 % . . . =
014 H [nods affirmatively]
015 R =which is. . very. . very reasonable. . . » Altermann uses=
[hands moving]
016 =what? 40% waste?
017 E yeah.
018 H I don't vanna see ()
[moves chin up]
019 E [smiles and looks at camera]
020 R uhm?
021 H vanna do me a favor?
022 R yes.
023 H I don't have the patience for this. tell us what. . . you feel=
024 =you have to get for the merchandise [yeah, the end price.
025 C [I'm not interested /in this,/
026 H I'm not interested /in this,/
027 E «/no, it's only to see where ()/
028 H [I understand, it's very nice=
029 =writing, it's very pretty. [flips pages condescendingly].
030 R no, it's, you know,
031 H [just tell me what the cost of the item will be.
032 E ah: «we have to work together. (3.2)
033 R ok, number one in this-
[right hand in the air trying to
grab some invisible object]
034 H [if the price is is competitive, fine, we buy it,=
035 =if it's not competitive, we won't buy it [right, we bought-
036 C [but to,=
037 E [Larry, [to go over . . . to go over each thing] . . . is silly=
038 [no, but- [yeah.
039 H [for us. (1.7) we're not a manufacturer, you're the manufacturer.
040 E yeah, but you have- the problem is in the material,
041 H I understand that.
042 E [the material for this and. . .
043 H yeah, but after I hear the price, then we'll look at the=
044 E =item, . . .
045 C [yeah, and see, [and you tell us,
046 H [and we'll see what we can cut down.
047 E ok.

In this segment, it is interesting to note that before Harry's direct rejection of the routine (line 18), Roberto and

Eduardo had already introduced three background information items. First Roberto started by giving directions for the reading of the cost sheets (lines 2-6). Then Eduardo proposed the remark about the exchange rate (line 7), which Roberto elaborated (line 8-12). Finally Roberto referred to their generous percentage for waste in the calculation by comparing that to what was used by a Western European importer in his calculations (lines 13-17). These were important elements supporting a metamessage that the price to come was right because they were being fair in all they could.

Harry's refusal to accept the routine was very direct (line 18). His point was typically made. He stated it once (lines 23-24), Charles rephrased it (line 25), Harry himself repeated it another two times (lines 26 and 31), and then he supported it (lines 34-42). Harry and Charles view of "the right way of doing business" is also clearly apparent when they supported Harry's point (lines 34-42). It contrasted sharply with Eduardo's startled protest (line 32).

It is thus evident from the stretch above that Eduardo's point trying to make sure that the importers agreed with the use of cost sheets during the quoting of the prices was not interpreted by the two Americans as Eduardo had intended.

In the passage above Harry and Charles fit the stereotypical description of the American businessman in Tannen (1986a:31):

American men's information-focused approach to talk has shaped the American way of doing business. Most Americans think it's best "to get down to brass tacks" as soon as possible, and not "waste time" in small talk (social talk) or "beating around the bush." But this does not work very well in business dealings with Greek, Japanese or Arab counterparts for whom "small talk" is necessary to establish the social relationship that must provide the foundation of conducting business.

Harry and Charles' reaction is directly comparable to Aristotle's (p. 1414^b) feeling about introductions to the statements (points) of arguments. Aristotle's *introduction* is the beginning of an argument 'paving the way, as it were, for what is to follow.' In the example above Harry took Roberto's background information not as a point as he had done before, but as an introduction, an unnecessary one. Like Harry, Aristotle (p.1415^b) reacted to the introduction as something negative if dispensable:

... it is therefore ridiculous to put this kind of thing in the beginning, when every one is listening with most attention. ... Introductions are popular with those whose case is weak, or looks weak; it pays them to dwell on everything rather than the actual facts of it.

Communication problems continued escalating in the segment:

S5.EG26.L050-65.

050 E ok.

051 R ok, one comment. you have the bag there ()

052 C yeah.

[hands over bag over table]

053 R the lining,

054 H [but this don't.. mean a thing. / (2.0)]

055 R the lining that we.. made this.. uh was the imitation suede,=

056 =ok?.. and and from the sample making.. uh people, they said=

057 =that uh if we could instead of using this imitation suede=

058 =if we could use.. nylon, [.. that would make a difference.

059 E Roberto, [we give the price=

060 =with imitation suede ()

061 H [thank you very- thank you very much]

062 C [yeah.

063 H thank you ve- ↑↑and then, if we go.. with a different lining,=

064 =then you tell us how much less it's gonna be.

065 E [yeah, then we begin,

Just as Eduardo had agreed to proceed as Harry demanded (line 50), Roberto restarted the routine with more background information (line 51). He went on adding more details (lines 53 and 55-58) until Eduardo interrupted him to remind him of Harry and Charles' demand (line 59). Harry then congratulated Eduardo for the act (line 61-3).

Roberto clung to his style in this example in a complementary

schismogenesis, a phenomenon occurring when 'each partner's characteristic style leads the other to apply increasingly extreme forms of the conflicting style' (Tannen 1981a:226). Even after Eduardo had prompted him to quit the routine in the fashion of their style, after Harry had congratulated Eduardo for it, Roberto kept insisting, ending up in a quite uncomfortable position:

S5.EG27.L066-71.

- 066 R 'cause this would affect even productivity, working on=
 067 =imitation is.. much slower operation.
 068 H Roberto, I appreciate what you're saying, but let's start=
 069 =from the finished product. (2.5)
 070 E /as we made here./ (6.5) tá envergonhado. (laughs) (laughs)
 071 R (grins)

The example above shows a change in footing, as Eduardo switched to Portuguese and then laughed (line 70). He acknowledged Roberto's uneasiness, and by changing his footing, seemed to be able to offer Roberto a chance to save his face. There was a long pause in talk until they were ready to quote the price.

S5.EG28.L072-96.

- 072 R posso falar isso aqui?
 073 E yes. (laughs)
 074 R Harry,
 >075 C they're ready. (3.5)
 >076 R \$ 55 94. (acc)
 >077 H /put it away./ (5.0)
 >078 E you have a price of \$ 40.. with corrected leather,
 079 H uncorrected leather.
 080 E uncorrected leather.
 >081 H the price that I have is 40 dollars. ↑nuh nuh nuh,
 >082 E [no::
 >083 E it's corrected?
 084 H [the samples you have is corrected,
 (index sticking out moving to the rhythm of talk)
 085 R right.
 086 H the samples that we are having now is uncorrected.
 087 R [right.
 088 H identical leather as you have.
 >089 E by \$ 40?
 090 H 40 dollars and 30 cents. (5.0)
 >091 E and what kind of lining?
 092 R nylon.
 093 H [whatever was in the sample.

The importers really thought that the price for the item was too high, since it compared very badly to the prices quoted by the Czechoslovakians. The fact that the Brazilian manufacturers could not provide the background information prior to their quoting the price made the price seem worse than it was. When Harry complained, Eduardo tried to support his own claim that the price was right. The manufacturers' attempt to justify the price only served to strengthen the importers' feelings that it was wrong.

[servente comes in to serve them tea]

Eduardo just tossed in some evidence (line 12) that should support his point that the item was indeed expensive (too much leather, extensive and complex lining). But Harry and Charles took each piece of evidence as a point and quickly counterargued (line 13). Eduardo's question regarding a possible change in the item to reduce leather consumption (line 14) was rejected in Harry and Charles' typically direct style (lines 15-16 and 18-19).

The result of these two point-making rounds was the failure of the Brazilian party to argue the adequacy of their pricing. In the first round, Harry and Charles' rejected the background information before the manufacturers' point could be implicitly made. This invalidated any supporting potential that those pieces of information could have. In the second round, Eduardo's ~~inability to rephrase the point from scratch in Harry and Charles' fashion made his supporting evidence extremely vulnerable to~~ counterarguing. The contextual outcome of this was that the American party felt they had proved the Brazilian party's argument wrong when the Brazilian party felt they had not been proved wrong.

Despite all the problems in the example above, all prices were quoted in the same routine. The following example occurred less than an hour after the previous excerpt:

S8.EG30.L001-9.

- 001 H now listen to this one.
 >002 R now number one, (1.8) we could go for nylon instead of=
 003 =imitation.
 >004 H [do me a favor.=
 >005 =do me a favor, give me.. the price.. then we will discuss=
 >006 C [quote us the price.
 >007 H =.... your suggestions.. of how to reduce it.. but let's get=
 >008 =the basic price. (1.4) that item is 6 9 5 3 5. (13.8) the=
 009 H =only one that may be workable is the big one.. 6 9 5 3 4.

Once again, Roberto tried to establish a series of background

information items (line 2), and Harry interrupted his speech to demand that the price be quoted before they discussed whether it was right or wrong (line 4-8).

The examples presented above referred to the quoting of prices on two items that was done in the morning. In the afternoon, there were still a number of prices to be quoted, but samples and costs had not been completed yet. Once again the same problem occurred.

S11.EG31.L001-13.

001 H alright, so let's work on this one.

[acc]

002 R //alright.// (12.1) one th- uh: Eduardo is suggesting and=

003 =I think makes sense that... if we could (2.2)

[opens case flap on table]

004 E work on this item.

[dec]

005 R if we could work on this item (1.4) to see what we.. can=

006 =do.. to make (3.4) you know- to to bring the cost down.

007 H well let's see what the price is first.

~~008 R no it's not finished yet.~~

~~009 E but uh only to to to save... the work I will=~~

[stands up and starts heading towards door]

010 =make the calculations but uh.. I'm seeing the price here=

011 =and I think.. that.. it's so leather that,

[standing by the door]

012 H yeah, but one thing you don't have all those little=

013 =compartments like on the ci-

In this example both manufacturers tried to argue that doing the routine in their style would be especially appropriate at that moment, since they had no price to give (lines 2-6). Harry demanded to see the price first (line 7). Roberto then made it clear that the price was not yet available (line 8), while Eduardo insisted on their previous point (lines 9-11), but Harry counterargued (line 12). The conversation then proceeded from Eduardo's mentioning of the amount of leather it took to produce the case:

S11.EG32.L014-48.

014 E

Lif you don't need, ok.

[acc]

>015 H on the cigar case... on that: case that you want uh: 59=
016 =dollars from Argentina. (1.7) you don't have all those=
017 =different compartments(1.8) ↑here it's strictly the leather.(2.2)
018 E yes.
>019 H but you don't have a lot of compartments like the other=
020 =one does.=
>021 R now listen, we do have, there's this pocket,
(showing open case)
>022 H [ah Roberto=
023 =don't- this, (1.2)
(makes disgusted face, looks at Eduardo and at Charles)
024 R we have- (2.4)
025 H ()
>026 R listen, Harry, /(let me) show you/....
(stands up and walks towards Harry)
027 H I know the case better than you do, don't show me.
028 R [nah-]right.
>029 H I am comparing it to the case... with the handle and the=
030 =lock. (1.1) there's a lot more work on that case than=
031 =there is on this case.=
>032 R not a lot more work work there.
>033 H [oh Roberto, please./
>034 R Harry, please, /take a look./you've got this,=

-035-H

036 H =looking- I'm looking.

037 R =and this, . . . plus this.

038 H Those are empty compartments.

039 R L plus this. . plus this.

040 H they're empty compartments. (1.9) I'm talking about=

041 =the different pockets and the different- with the pen=

042 =holders and the business card holders you don't have all=

043 =those little different parts, on this case like you do on=

044 =the other one... what's all I'm saying. (3.4) give a good=

[moves back to his seat]

045 =surprise for a ch- fufufor a change. Jesus Christ.

[acc]

046 R you're gonna get new attache cases.

[faces E to talk in Port.]

047 C wait until you hear the prices on those. (8.0)

>048 H you're not making it easy for us to do business with you.

Harry counterargued Eduardo's claim that this case consumed a lot of leather by saying the additional leather was compensated by the fact that there was no additional labor factor in the pricing of the item (lines 15-17). Roberto then argued that labor was also an important factor for this case as well (lines 21-23, 32, 34, 37 and 39).

In this passage there was a compromise between the parts. After all, they were discussing the right price before the price was quoted. Still, the result of this compromise was not at all satisfactory for Harry and Charles, as can be seen in Harry's comment transcribed in line 48.

The basic issue in all of the negotiation of the prices involved the criteria for what made an item expensive or not. The two parties agreed that the criteria were labor intensity and consumption of supplies (mainly leather). But they disagreed on a number of other aspects, especially on what features of an item could be discarded, on what supplies could be substituted, and on what made an item labor intensive.

Harry and Charles tried to understand the pricing by isolating the two criteria. Until late in the event, however, Eduardo and Roberto were still unable to communicate ~~their point~~ that they saw the pricing as involving the two criteria holistically. They tried to provide the background information before quoting the price by referring to both aspects, but as I have shown, they could not proceed until they could get to that point.

Therefore, when Roberto and Eduardo provided scattered evidence involving labor intensity and consumption of supply in a fragmented format as I showed above, they reinforced Harry and Charles' expectation, according to which one should look at the item and judge from the two criteria, one at a time, and then see if the price is right.

The passage below comes right after most prices had been quoted:

S16.EG33.L001-19.

>001 H all the cases are roughly fif-fourteen 15 % difference.
 002 C ()
 003 H every single item is
 004 E and also the: the ()
 005 H with the exception=
 006 =of of.. your your uh:
 >007 E the leather that we are calculation here is very very=
 008 H your 6 9 5 2 8.
 009 E =cheap. (1.7) we never had.. in: our story.. a price in=
 010 =leather as we are making now... Sure (2.3) you know, one=
 (shoulders up and down)
 >011 H raises eyebrows quickly; glass off) (dec)
 >012 =point.. sixty four.. plus 20% of waste (4.1) /twenty=
 013 =per cent of waste, / this iss-(2.3) and then we can speak=
 014 =about another material but uh.. we saw that the material=
 015 =is not uh.. the difference is not too:
 >016 H /we have no future. / (3.8) (acc)
 >017 E and about the the.. the labor, we have here, we are=
 018 =putting here, ten per cent of the total value... the:=
 019 =() value is our... labor... 10 % only. (5.8)

In this example, Eduardo presented the two aspects affecting the price, implying that they should both be taken into account.

~~They were debating the differences between Brazil and Czechoslovakia (line 1). Lines 7-10 refer to leather consumption, and lines 12-15 refer to consumption of other materials; lines 17-19 refer to labor intensity. Harry and Charles had already given their view that the Courofatos' prices were unsubstantiated, so they were annoyed at Eduardo's repetition of the points they believed they had already proved wrong (lines 11 and 16).~~

The item Harry referred to above - the 69528 - (line 8) was at the heart of the whole dispute because of a number of reasons. It was probably the item the importers wanted the most; while the manufacturers saw no relative value in it. It was also the item that compared worst to the Czechoslovakian target price. In addition, the item was very similar to an existing item which Courofatos was selling for about 40% less. The key to the

substantiation of this price was also the key to settling the dispute, but everything hinged on the understanding that the case involved a little bit more supplies and a lot more labor, which together could substantiate the difference to some extent.

The solution to the impasse only came after a series of tense arguments where the two point-making styles seemed to be in permanent complementary schismogenesis.

Early in the last session, Charles requested clarifications from the Brazilian manufacturers about the pricing of the 69528.

This time the two manufacturers were able to make their points:

S32.EG34.L013-52.

>013 E Charlie, while.. we make two of this, we make one=
[points with pen to 1719]

>014 =of this.. in the production.
[69528]

015 C yeah,

016 E do you accept?

017 C no.

018 E (I) accept.

019 C [no: I-

>020 E [no, you see that.. has uh too much labor. (9.2) here.. this,
[stands up and moves over to where 69528 is]

>021 C I see there's more here.]

022 E [here, [stitching,

023 C yeah.

024 E here, (4.9)

>025 C but ONCE this thing is cut, ok? and once it's put=

026 =together with the tapes,.. before they stitch it.. (1.6)=

027 =I mean::uh:

>028 E [yeah, and then?]

>029 C it: goes through.... is this a double needle or a single?

030 E single.

>031 C single needle. you don't have double [needle machines like=

032 E [no.

[nods negatively many times]

>033 C =that? (1.6) why?

034 E to make the same time? the the the: (both)?

[shows stitching on 69528]

035 C yeah.

036 E no, (one time).

>037 H why not?

[sitting back in his seat]

[dec]

>038 C that's such a simple [machine.

039 E [but normally we don't make this=

[moving towards his seat]

[shows stitching on 69528]

040 =kind. . of of of work.
 >041 C you don't do any double stitching?
 (index and thumb touching; hand in the air)
 042 E yeah, but. . together.
 (shows it on case)
 >043 C yeah, but those machines are: adjustable, no?
 044 E (nods negatively)
 >045 C the ones you have are NOT adjustable. (10.5)
 (index and thumb moving back and forth showing different widths)
 >046 H /so use a single stitch in this item.../ //what's the=
 (yawns)
 047 =big deal...// /like the P O 7, Charlie./
 048 C yeah... yeah.
 049 H /(could use) a single stitch./ (1.2)
 050 C or don't use any stitch. (1.2)
 (index covering mouth in 'thinking' position)
 (acc)
 051 H /(then they have to use) a full panel./
 052 C yeah.

In this first part of the segment Charles did what Eduardo expected him to do: follow the development of background information towards the point, signaling doubts, asking for clarification on the particular steps, until he saw what the point was (lines 21/25/29/31/33/37). Harry also joined him sometimes (lines 38/41/43/45). Charles had agreed (line 21) that the 69528 was more labor intensive than the existing style they were comparing it with. At the end of the passage above Charles and Harry finally saw that there were production problems affecting labor intensity which they had not realized.

Harry and Charles had not realized this until that moment because the manufacturers had been unable to support their point (that the item was really labor intensive). And the manufacturers had been unable to support their point in part because of the conflicting feature of the two parties' point-making styles.

The point that the two criteria had to be taken together and not in isolation was still to be made, as the following excerpt shows:

S32.EG35.L073-89.

- 073 C =honestly, I.. ve vanna work with you... this Carrar program=
 (moving back to his seat)
- 074 =can be huge. gah- I mean,... it can be great for everybody.=
- >075 E =ve also want to: work with you, but I.. what I cannot=
 076 =ac- accept is that you give me.. five per cent more on this=
 077 =one.. than you are uh you're paying today to us.. in this.. =
 078 =this st- style. (you) don't believe, this.. has.. too much=
 079 =material.. that this has.. also the labor is twice.. this=
 080 =(1.2) yes, [↑]sure. I'm.. I know I know that.. in production.. =
 081 =this... will be.. this is what uh uh ve talked with=
 082 =the people here... ve showed to the people here what do=
 083 =you think about this (here).
- >084 C [↑]so how much is the labor?
- >085 E no, no it's not about only of the- how much is the labor. if=
 086 =I make, for example, 200 thousand dollars in one section,=
 087 =I'm- I will do only.. 100.. thousand.. US dollars.. all the=
 (points to 69528)
- >088 =things, labor, everything.. ve ve have to uh.. ratear?
- >089 C you're pro-rating over the whole line?

The point was clearly made this time in Eduardo's style but with Charles indispensable cooperation (lines 94-96).

S32.EG36.L094-100.

[conversation breaks into two floors for 17"]

-
- 094 C yeah, but what he's saying is that uh he's got a higher=
 095 =unit, (1.5) if he makes 200 thousand dollars worth of=
 096 =this, he can only make say 150 thousand of this.
- 097 R [and ve gotta pay the same:
- 098 C [and he's making up the the.. difference.. WITH US] [↑](with)=
- 099 E ,
- 100 =the same cost.

In the example above Harry and Charles discussed the manufacturers' point that had finally been made. The evidence that Eduardo's intent was communicated, at last, comes from this moment after a brief pause in the negotiation when the negotiators talked within their teams.

Even though the manufacturers' point was made, the sour feeling of having spent tense hours arguing over misinterpreted intent was unavoidable. Since participants were unaware that the sour feeling stemmed mainly from a communication problem, they blamed the other participants' personality, or the relationship, as Harry did at the end of the segment above:

S32.EG37.L104.

104 H the- there's a difference in philosophy.

The hazard of problems like the one presented above is that, as Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982a:3) observed,

... what starts as isolated situation-bound communication differences at the individual level may harden into ideological distinctions that then become value-laden, so that everytime problems of understanding arise they serve to create further differences in the symbolization of identity.

6.2.4 "Do you think I am being dishonest?" - Intent it misunderstood

The last communication problem caused by conflicts between the two parties' conversational style is the most serious of all regarding the quality of the participants interaction and relationship. The three preceding problems were shown to cause ~~lack of communication of intent, frustration, and unease.~~ Eventually those problems came to be ~~somehow discussed~~ and partly remedied in the course of the event. The example to be presented next is of a type that is difficult to clear up. It is a serious problem of miscommunication.

I have already referred to a few moments in the negotiation when Eduardo or Roberto elicited some background information from their American interlocutors in order to later make a point supported by the elicited background information. The most important example of this was when Eduardo asked Harry how many pieces Harry expected to order per item during the coming year.

The segment is transcribed below:

S36.EG38.L001-16.

>001 E Harry, to to... 91, uh:, what would be the the.. the=

>002 =quantities here? (3.3)
(looking down at notes)

003 H on the five items?
(fixing his tea)

004 E yes.

>005 H I would say 25 hundred pieces //each//. (1.8)
 006 E /two?/
 006 R well,
 007 H I have to be conservative.
 008 R you're talking about four items, right?
 009 H 4 or 5 eh: I would say... in the area of two=
 010 R you dropped... this one.
 (stands up and puts case away)
 011 H =thousand, five hundred pieces... per item. (2.2)
 >012 E to 21?
 (looking down at notes)
 >013 H because uh... I don't think you're gonna be able to=
 014 =produce everything for me... if I say five thousand, I=
 015 =know you'll never produce- be able to produce five=
 016 =thousand... based on what Roberto said at the dinner yesterday.

At that time Harry gladly provided the information because it meant a reference to volume, which to him was always a key reference. That piece of information later resulted in Eduardo's proposal of quotas, which was elaborated on, and which settled the deal.

~~In the passage to be presented below Eduardo prompted Harry to provide a piece of information with the same purpose in mind. They had previously discussed potential imports from Romenia to Courofatos via Amage. Later on, Courofatos quoted the prices on the items in the new collection and Harry maintained they were unrealistic. Immediately before the moment transcribed below, Eduardo had been out of the room. When Eduardo came back in, he had devised a scheme joining imports from Romenia and exports to Amage in a single deal:~~

S18.EG39.L001-2.

>001 E Harry, you think that you.. you cannot have a better price.. =
 (closes door)

>002 =eh.. to pay in Romenia? (1.5) than this that you gave me? (4.5)

However, Eduardo did not frame the proposal as such, which was what Harry would expect (line 1). Faithful to his style, Eduardo asked a question which to Harry was the indirect implication of an FTA (lines 1-2). As has already been shown,

Harry himself once switched to an indirect strategy when doing a serious FTA. Therefore, what to Eduardo was a prompting for background information to support a potential point, to Harry was an unequivocal offense (lines 1-2).

The example below shows this miscommunication of intent quite clearly. During the long pause (4.5") before he answered, Harry reacted non-verbally to Eduardo's question. Harry interpreted the question as a signal of personal distrust. He thus replied with another question:

S18.EG40.L003-15.

003 E [moves over to his seat, sees H's angry face and=
004 =smiles, then sits]
[acc]
005 H /What are you? a wise guy?/
[standing across from E; looks over his glasses]
>006 E uhn? no, I'm thinking another thing. (3.2)
[scratches forehead; looks down at notes]
>007 H I can only charge you what I'm paying...
[hand on chest]
008 E ok. (1.2)
>009 H I will tell you this.... that if you get.. Altermann=
>010 =to go to Romenia, he'll pay 25% more.
011 E yeah, sure.
[sitting with arms crossed]
>012 H /Of what we're paying/. What's for sure.. All I=
>013 =am doing is charging you 10%... on the FOB price,=
>014 =that's all, I'll show you my cost...
015 E you don't need to.. () (6.0)

Eduardo did not understand Harry's question (line 6), but he understood that Harry had misinterpreted his original question about the price of the Romenian goods ("I'm thinking another thing"). Eduardo was ready to drop the subject, accepting Harry's reaction as a curtailing of his potential point (line 6). He even moved on to do something else (look at his notes). But Harry was reacting, not to a request for information, but to Eduardo's FTA (doubting that the prices he had quoted from Romenia were the cheapest anyone could get - lines 7-14).

Harry wanted to make his point unquestionable. He wanted to show that Eduardo had been wrong, so he got his notes out to show it to the two manufacturers (line 16 below):

S18.EG41.L016-37.

>016 H here, I'll=

[gets papers from case; moves over to E]

017 H =show it to you.

>018 E you don't need to show me.

>019 H ↑I wanna SHOW it to you, so you know I'm. . I don't play games.

>020 R nobody is saying that you play games.

>021 H aah: but aah-

>022 E [↑ah::

>023 R come on Harry. (4.8)

>024 E if you say, ok.

025 H 3 75, 20 38, . . add the hardware. (2.9)

[showing notes]

026 R [yeah.

027 H 4 dollars and 4 cents. [now add the 10%. 20 dollars and. . . =

028 E [uh huh.

029 H =20 38 plus 4 uh 4 add the 10% (you see what I mean) /and=

030 E [uh huhn.

031 H =if you go on, / (I'm) it's (my own calculations.)

032 E it's because you have to sell () times 4. . . to give=

033 =30 days to pay. (2.5) it's a good price.

034 H this is strictly an accomodation, believe me.

[folder falls [heavy on the [floor; loud noise]

035 E [we ve- [we know. . that you,

036 H I'm not looking to make money. (7.0)

[moves over to his seat and sits down to light a cigarette]

037 E I was talking about uh. . to make a (b-) a-

[signals 'agreement' (?) =

=by making fingers of both hands interlock)

From Harry's standpoint, Eduardo's resignation in dropping the subject acknowledged Harry's interpretation. Thus Harry had to go on with his interpretive strategy.

To doubt Harry's honesty had not been Eduardo's intent (lines 1-2); Eduardo had not even made his point yet. Therefore, by making a point of showing to Eduardo and Roberto that he had not been lying (lines 16/19/21), Harry was performing another FTA in return for the one he misinterpretedly thought Eduardo had performed against him. The two manufacturers reacted to this together then (lines 18/20/22/23/24).

Eduardo's last line (37) in the example above is revealing of his original intention in asking the question that started the incident (lines 1-2). His point was to propose a combination of both deals together in one (Courofatos would sell its products to Amage for the price Amage wanted, and import the previously negotiated merchandise from Romenia via Amage with a special discount). However, at this point the context was no longer the same as before line 1. Harry was sure he had been offended, and Eduardo's point was never attended to.

In the terms used by Putnam (1985:229) in her discussion on negotiation interaction, Harry perceived Eduardo's question as a competitive move. This affected the flow of negotiation, which turned from somewhat cooperative to very competitive from then on.

Putnam says:

~~If both bargainers begin with a cooperative pattern then one defects to a sequence of competitive moves, negotiators will end up in escalating conflict. ... If a negotiator switches to a competitive sequence, the first bargainer deems his or her opponent as untrustworthy and thus responds with a competitive move.~~

The exchange had thus evolved towards miscommunication as each participant reacted to the other's style. The participants were not aware, though, that 'others' ways of talking to you are partly a reaction to your style, just as your style with them is partly a reaction to their style - with you' (Tannen 1986a:40). The general feeling was that everyone had shown mutual distrust, and what is worse, when no one was being untrustworthy.

The above discussion has two important implications. The first is that there was tremendous misunderstanding caused by different conversational styles, a misunderstanding that, as far as the parties were concerned, was never clarified. The second is

that the context in which this misunderstanding occurred determined that what could have been a sensible proposal to settle the deal was to be discarded altogether. Though this is only hypothetical, the fact that a similar exchange originated the proposal that actually settled the deal is symptomatic of how much time and effort (and face) could have been saved, had the incident been avoided.

The incident discussed above is an unfortunate example of the problems of communication deriving from what Wolfson (1989:15) called sociolinguistic diversity:

With no other frame of reference at their disposal, ... speakers have little choice but to interpret what they hear according to the rules of speaking of their own native speech communities. And since the rules are very likely to be quite different, misunderstandings are almost inevitable. The result may be amusement or contempt, but it is just as likely to be disappointment, shock or even serious insult.

In the example of the Romanian prices above, ~~the problem is~~ of this second type, more specifically described by Tannen (1986a:18) as follows:

If someone doesn't quite get our point, we let it go, the talk continues, and no one pays much attention. But if an important outcome hangs on the conversation - if it's a job interview, a *business meeting*, or a doctor's appointment - the results can be very serious. (emphasis added)

What is more important is that as Gumperz, Tannen, Erickson and their associates have pointed out, these communication problems due to conversational style tend to enter into the formation of ethnic stereotypes. As Thomas (1983:107) puts it,

... a speaker who is not operating according to the standard grammatical code is at worse condemned as "speaking badly," the person who operates according to differently formulated pragmatic principles may be censured as behaving badly: as being an untruthful, deceitful, or insincere person.

When these persons refer to each other by naming the ethnic or national groups they belong to, the danger that the judgements

they pass on one another will be extended to those groups as a whole is great, thus entering into the formation of ethnic stereotypes.

The next chapter concludes this study by discussing the power control mechanisms in the interaction and the pedagogical implications of the research findings.

Chapter 7

Concluding Remarks and Implications

Throughout this work I have shown how an unshared feature of conversational style affected the interaction of negotiators as well as the development of the bargaining process in a cross-cultural business negotiation involving American and Brazilian parties.

I started by defining the research tradition within which the research was to be understood. I then moved on to outline the theoretical principles concerning the research methodology. These principles formed the foundation of the ethnographic microanalysis of interaction developed upon participant-observation and audio-visual recording of a cross-cultural business negotiation.

In a second stage, I identified the three main activities in the interaction in order to have a comprehensive view of the event in its subdivisions, and to restrict the focus of analysis. This was accomplished through a frame analysis that also showed the dynamic character of the interactional context.

Following this, I discussed the concepts that were central to the data analysis, concepts such as genre, negotiation talk, conversational style, cross-cultural communication, point and point-making. Having thus established a theoretical as well as a methodological foundation for the discussion of samples collected from the primary data source, I set out to describe the two patterns of point-making observed in the utterances of the participants in the American and Brazilian negotiation parties. In

addition to describing and demonstrating the two stylistic strategies used by the two parties as far as their main occurrences were concerned, I also discussed exceptional examples in which participants inverted their strategic choices. These counterexamples were shown to be context-motivated, thus reinforcing the claim that the participants' point-making styles were consistent, and that they were ethnically based.

Finally, four types of communication problems were raised and examined to show how the two point-making strategies in point-making conflicted in the course of the negotiation. In this discussion, I hope to have made clear that, although the two parties had optimal levels of personal cooperation and rapport, their conversational styles interfered negatively in their interaction every time they were unable to interpret each other's communicative intent as expected by the uttering party.

The research and its findings demonstrated that different conversational styles were at play in the interaction. It also showed that the interpretive expectations entailed by the different stylistic choices in point-making generated communication problems which in turn affected both the course of the interactions and the quality of the relationship among the participants. The theoretical framework built up mainly on the work of Gumperz (1982a), Erickson (1988), Tannen (1984) and their associates proved to be extremely appropriate to the description of the data and to its analysis.

Before concluding this work, I would like to refer to a couple of aspects that affect the interpretation of my findings. Initially, I will discuss the relevance of an eventual analysis of

ideological control of the interaction as well as make suggestions for further research. At a second stage I will discuss the implications that can be derived from the findings reported here as far as research methodology and ELT are concerned.

7.1 Remarks About Power Control Mechanisms in the Negotiation at Courofatos

In my analysis of the conflicting conversational styles in the business negotiation event at Courofatos I have only briefly referred to issues involving power control mechanisms in the interaction. These references were not developed for two reasons. First, the tradition of research to which this work adheres tends to emphasize the micro parameters of the interaction instead of macro or external ones. ~~Second, because I believe that the role of ideology and power control mechanisms in an international cross-cultural business interaction is a research issue that deserves a profound study in its own right.~~

However, many of the moments in which the two point-making styles conflicted were brought about by the American negotiators' interruption of the Brazilian negotiators' turns. These phenomena evoked the need for the present consideration. I would like therefore to discuss the issue here a bit further than I have done in the body of this study. My purpose is twofold. On the one hand, I want to stress that it is an aspect that deserves investigation in its own right elsewhere. On the other hand, I want to stress that it is an aspect that does not play a determinant role in the occurrence of the two point-making styles, being therefore dispensable for their description.

As Gumperz (1982a, 1982b) points out, in interactional sociolinguistics one is interested in the detailed analysis of interaction 'to account for the role that communicative phenomena play in the exercise of power and control and in the production and reproduction of social identity' (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982a:1). It is within this frame that the present analysis was carried out, i.e. 'to understand issues of identity and how they affect and are affected by social, political, and ethnic divisions we need to gain insights into the communicative processes by which they arise' (p.1). Therefore, within this theoretical framework one is looking at the micro level of communicative interaction before any macro level parameters are invoked. Macro parameters are not denied or neglected; they are expected to surface as a result of the analysis; ~~they are not taken a priori.~~

The power of interactants over one another is a parameter that has its origin prior to the micro interactional context. However, as Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz observed, this issue affected and was affected by the interaction. The insights into the communicative processes of the negotiation revealed some phenomena that seemed to be connected to what Wiemann (1985) called "control." According to Wiemann (1985:86),

... control is the constellation of constraints people place on one another by the manipulation of both interactional structure and content, which delimit the options appropriately available subsequently to each relational partner and the relational system as a whole.

By looking at the uncomfortable moments of the interaction and by identifying the two different styles, I also noticed that there seemed to be an asymmetry in the overlapping utterances. The Americans seemed to have more of "a right" to interrupt and to

resist interruptions than the Brazilians did in reverse.

All participants overlapped and interrupted one another's turns at various moments in the event. It is not the case that different turn-taking styles were at play. However, the American participants, especially Harry, took over the floor by overlapping and interrupting, many times when there was obstinate resistance from the Brazilian holder of the turn. When a similar exchange happened in reverse, Harry would resist yielding the floor, even through power-laden metacommunicative expressions of his right to hold the floor. The following segment shows an example of this:

TS25.EG1.L001-21.

001 H I think this is a very fair offer.... I really do.. the=
[throws sheet of paper=

```
=flying across the table]
```

002 =only the only problem you have,
[index moving to rhythm of talk; then stops moving, but=
~~=keeps hanging in the air]~~

003 E the-the thirty six is is.. =

004 =is terrible.

Let let=

>006 =let let me talk.. let me talk, please. (1.4) <respect=

007 =people that are older than you. (1. 6)

008 E uhm?

[raising head from looking at notes]

>009 H respect people that are older than you. /and I'm older=

>010 =than you, so you have to.. let me talk first.../ I am=

011 =telling you right now that if you look at the- (4.9) 28. =

012 = (6.5) and you look at the 17 19... you can't justify=
 [dec]

```
013      =the price you're asking.... if you can't... it makes no sense=
      [dec]
```

014 =whatsoever. (1.2) it's completely, completely wrong.

015 R

	[do-	[do you=
--	------	----------

016 =think there's only two dollar difference between both items?

017 H /that's all there is./

[nodding affirmatively]

018 C Lyeah.

019 H if we make the vinyl, instead of the leather, that's=

020 =all there is. (1.8)

021 C put the gussets in vinyl (1.4) the file gussets. (22.0)

ALL (looking down at notes)

Harry and Charles were more powerful than Eduardo and Roberto. They were much older than the two Brazilians. This was

clearly taken as an acceptable power-criterion by all participants, as can be seen in the segment above. They were also more experienced than the two Brazilians, as the many references to their business trips all over the world in the last 25 years indicated. In addition, Harry and Charles were the native speakers of the language of contact. As I have mentioned before, 'an asymmetrical power relationship exists between native and non-native speakers (whether the nativer speaker is conscious of it or not)' (Thomas 1983:106; Sgarbieri 1990). Finally, Harry and Charles were the citizens of the most powerful country in the world, whereas Eduardo and Roberto were citizens of a troubled third world country struggling to reach the standards of first-world nations. As a consequence of all this, the American negotiators had more choices-in-terms of exercising control.

Thus it is clear that there is reason to mention this complex issue here because the control of the interaction as such is affected by it. As Wiemann put it (1985:94/7)

By making strategic choices concerning how and when to accomplish a change of speaker, interactants can reinforce an existing definition of who is in control (both right now in this conversation and in the relationship over time), ... viewed as a conversational resource, interruption becomes a tactic available for interactants to use to accomplish some conversational or relational goal - e.g. to dominate a conversation, to establish dominance in a relationship, ... It would be a mistake ... to count all interruptions as merely rude behaviour.

Though a relevant aspect of the interaction deserving a careful study elsewhere, the power control mechanisms surfaced as a result of my analysis. The findings related to the existence of two different point-making styles in conversation and the communication problems they generated made the macro parameters discussed above come to surface.

The interruption of the Brazilian negotiators' point-making was one of the devices that triggered the communication problems arising from the different interpretive expectations entailed by the two styles. But although these phenomena tended to magnify the potential conflict clash between the two styles, they were not relevant in the identification and description of the participants' conversational styles and communication problems.

Therefore, individual participant power is an important issue to be analyzed in the negotiation at Courofatos for its own sake, since it seems to enter into the working gears of the interaction. It would deserve a whole study with the purpose of investigating it in detail, which has not been the case here. A careful look at the power control mechanisms is thus a strong suggestion for further research ~~based on the findings of this work.~~

Along this line, a few other aspects of cross-cultural communication would also deserve attention in the interaction at Courofatos. Among these are the two parties' apparently different concepts of truth, their different attitude vis-a-vis other-correction, and their different pragmatic use of conditionals.

Other suggestions for further research include the study of point-making in various genres of talk and in various different contexts of Brazilian life to determine to what extent the pattern found in the negotiations at Courofatos applies, in a broader sense, to a possible Brazilian conversational style. In addition, it would be of great interest to see studies contrasting the cross-cultural interaction focused on here with intracultural interactions of the same kind, that is, Brazilians negotiating

business among themselves vs. Americans negotiating business among themselves. This would eventually discuss other stylistic features other than point-making format.

It is in respect to these possibilities for further research that I see perhaps the greatest methodological contributions of this work. The description of the ethnographic part of my research in chapter 2 is the result of the application of Erickson's ethnographic work to research conditions in Brazil. The importance of this successful application lies in the fact that it made possible the collection of naturally occurring data of kind not readily available. The report of how this was accomplished should serve as potential guidelines for other Brazilian researchers interested in the investigation of human interaction in everyday life, not only in Linguistics but in other disciplines as well.

By the same token, the type of analysis carried out on this unusual data (in Brazil) is also a highlight of the present work, since it focuses on communication, not only on language, and since it puts an emphasis on participants in interaction more so than on speakers. Thus the study resulted in a picture of an event in which very different people interacted due to their business interests. Though this is a frequent event in urbanized societies like Brazil, the picture is still fairly novel in Brazilian Linguistics.

It is also interesting to note that the analysis demonstrated that those people had serious communication problems which went by undetected, as they talked about business interests that would affect not only their own lives, but also many other people's (Courofatos has around 500 employees). What is remarkable then is

that through studies like this we can start understanding endemic problems of communication which can have serious consequences.

Having justified what this research did not do, what could be done to extend the knowledge it produced, and how its methodology can be applied elsewhere, let me now discuss what the analysis of the negotiations at Courofatos implies for the teaching of English to students (of EFL, ESL and EIL) who would eventually get involved in the same or in similar types of interaction.

7.2 Implications of This Research to ELT

In the introduction of a talk delivered at a TESOL conference Tannen (1984c:1) once said 'cross-cultural communication is always closely related to teaching English as a second language.' For her as for me this is where the interest in cross-cultural communication was first evoked. And it is in the implications for ELT in Brazil that I see the practical relevance of this work.

According to Odlin (1989:69), 'misunderstandings related to politeness and coherence are especially dangerous, and thus discourse transfer should be a matter of special concern for teachers.' The cross-cultural communication problems found in the negotiation event at Courofatos were misunderstandings related especially to what Odlin calls coherence, and it is one of the claims of this work that they were the result of different cultural traditions of discourse organization.

The foreign or second language teacher should therefore be concerned with the different features of the traditions involved in his/her teaching. The present work contributes to strengthen

this claim for all language teachers, and to clarify specific features which should concern the teacher of English in Brazil.

It is in this sense that I see this work as corroborating Thomas' (1983:110) admonition in favor of cross-cultural sensitization in foreign and second language teaching, an addition that would make it real teaching instead of mere training:

Helping students to understand the way pragmatic principles operate in other cultures, encouraging them to look for the different pragmatic or discorsal norms which may underlie national and ethnic stereotyping, is to go some way towards eliminating simplistic and ungenerous interpretations of people whose linguistic behaviour is superficially different from their own.

To do this is also one of the aims of the microanalysis of interaction. Erickson's (1991:5) reference to the analysis of teaching interaction also applies to the implications of the findings about the negotiations at Courofatos to the teaching of English for specific purposes in Brazil. He says that

... detailed analysis of the *how* of interaction, in contrast to emphasis on its *what*, is also appropriate when one wants to change an existing educational practice, e.g., to alter a kind of conversation that never quite gets off the ground so that it can become a rich and engaging interactional environment for learning.

This can be thought as referring to, for instance, the teaching of ESP in Foreign Trade programs at some Brazilian universities where students have years of *training* in English. They are taught the *what* of the interaction they will face in their professional lives, but not the *how*. What is even worse, not only will their interactions while at work be affected by a lack of awareness of cross-cultural sensitivity, but also their English classes will be less a than rich interactional environment for learning, since many will have already learned that *what* elsewhere. This is what Roberto referred to in our first

interview, when he said that he was learning how to behave in the negotiation event while at it, all by himself, since what he had been taught at university seemed to be of little avail.

The only question is what exactly, and how, the knowledge produced in sociolinguistic research should be taught. Wolfson (1989) warns us about the controversial character of the issue. She even mentions specific dangers of a careless inclusion of sociocultural information in classroom instruction by 'materials writers and teachers, caught up in a wave of enthusiasm,' who would 'use their own knowledge as native speakers to provide students with such information' (p.30).

Thomas' (1983) distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure offers an interesting reference point in this reflection. Her argument ~~is that while the former 'is~~ basically a *linguistic* problem, caused by differences in the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force,' the latter (sociopragmatic failure) 'stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behaviour' (p.99). She also argues that while the pragmalinguistic problems should indeed be taught, sociopragmatic decision making 'should not be "corrected," but only pointed out and discussed' (p.109).

This seems fairly reasonable. The problems entailed by the different point-making styles in the negotiation at Courofatos are of this second type. They involve culture-specific perceptions of what is appropriate linguistic behavior. In this sense, it is not up to the ESP teacher, at a Foreign Trade program for example, to say that the Brazilian businessman should always state his points and then support them, because that is the "correct" way to do it

in English. Rather, it is up to him/her to tell students that there are different strategies for performing the same communicative task of arguing. It is up to this teacher to discuss with his/her students what may happen when people do not use the same strategies, and when they do not share conventions for the interpretation of intent, as in many cross-cultural encounters of the kind a foreign language speaker is likely to participate in.

In addition, other aspects concerning the findings of this research could be of use in such a classroom. For instance, we have reasons to believe that elegance of discourse is persuasive (Aristotle, Tannen 1987) and it may be a case that a particular point-making style is more persuasive than another. A cross-cultural negotiator should be aware that s/he may see ~~someone's discourse as persuasive because of its elegance.~~

Moreover, as another implication, Wolfson (1989:29) points out that 'knowing about the sociolinguistic patterns of middle-class Americans may be of extreme importance to the business-person, diplomat, or student who expects to interact intensively with native speakers of American English.'

To conclude this report on my research and its implications I make mine Wolfson's (1989:31/33) words once again:

... it is unclear whether rules of this nature can actually be taught in conventional ways. My own view is that the acquisition of sociolinguistic rules can be greatly facilitated by teachers who have the necessary information at their command and who have the sensitivity to use their knowledge in order to guide students and help them to interpret values and patterns which they would otherwise have difficulty in interpreting. ... Obviously, language learning does not require that people change their personalities or their most deeply ingrained principles concerning correct behavior; what is needed is for the learners to come to understand what is meant by the words and expressions they hear, and to be able to respond to them appropriately so that unnecessary miscommunication can be avoided.

APPENDIX

This appendix presents the complete transcripts of those interactional segments which did not appear in their entirety in the body of this study (segments 1, 4, 8, 15, 16, and 32). Contextual information is also given before each one of these transcripts. The transcripts of all the other segments, along with the information about their context, have already appeared in their complete versions (segments 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 23, 25, 30, 36, 37, and 41).

Each segment is introduced by a code. For example, transcription segment #1 is introduced by the following code: S1 - OCT 17 around 5:30 p.m.. This means that the following is the transcript of segment #1, which happened on October 17, around 5:30 p.m.. Some more contextual information follows before the transcribed text appears in numbered lines.

S1 - OCT 17 - around 5:30 p.m. - the end of the first session in which the three main activities in the event can identified. Roberto, Charles and Harry were talking about technical changes in the old line.

001 R now two things... concerning.. the 1714 (2.7) we make=
002 =this sample with this... binding,
003 C right (1.5)
004 R or (2.3) we could try to do something similar, you know,=
 (acc)
005 =to avoid the raw edge...
006 H what was that?
007 C [to avoid the raw edge.
008 R the 1714 is... uh raw edge.
009 C this case is?
010 R yeah.
011 H [yeah, we decided we were gonna get rid of the raw edge=

012 =rim) (1.5) they are having a lot of problems... in=
 013 =production.
 014 C [oh, yeah?
 015 H remember we discussed? oh, you weren't at that meeting. =
 016 =they're having major problems in raw edge.. and I said.. =
 017 =ok, you can turn it in.. I prefer this binding... better=
 018 =than this.
 019 C [oh, yeah... no, very definitely.. yeah, definitely.
 020 H cause this, this has substance... but we said wherever=
 021 C [yeah.. yeah.
 022 H =there's a raw edge- in fact they showed us the attach=
 023 H =case... the extended edge case that they'd turned in,
 024 C [yeah.
 025 C /oh, you can't turn it in./
 026 H Charlie, it looks... it looks gorgeous.
 027 R [looks VERY GOOD.. I think it'd look better=
 028 =than this.
 029 C do you have one here?
 030 R I think we ought to make that one.
 031 H Charlie, that looks gorgeous.
 032 C yeah? (1.2)
 033 H they're having nightmares on it.
 034 C /alright./
 035 R /yeah./
 036 H it's splitting the layers of.. of uh.. /leather/ (1.4)
 037 C /yeah/

 038 H () I saw a (Dutch Cashman) with that.
 039 C (Dutch), I think they're putting a binding on.
 040 H yep.
 041 C yep. (3.0)
 042 H look, (come on you), we have to cooperate.
 043 C [yeah, I know=
 044 =there's no question about it.
 045 H [you know=
 046 =they have problems... and if we're working together, we=
 047 =have to understand their problems. (2.0) so we'll cooperate=
 048 =(1.8) this is a long term program, this isn't just a;
 049 C [no,=
 050 =I understand that...
 051 H [look, I think you agree that=
 052 =whatever we promised, we fulfilled our promises (1.2) I=
 053 =mean, we came through (on) every conceivable way,
 054 R uh huh.
 055 H and we're gonna do more next year (1.5) [acc] and it's possible=
 056 =we can double our volume next year.
 057 C [oh, I think there's a=
 058 =good possibility of that;
 059 H [the question is is whether you=
 060 =have the ability- (1.8) to increase YOUR production....
 061 R we'd also like to do that.. to get there.
 062 H /well... I'm I'm not.. totally... convinced/ (1.8)
 063 R you know, as I told you, we... uh:: (1.7) we had these.. uh=
 064 =four meetings with uh two different engineers... to talk.. =
 065 =specifically about (1.5) /productivity/... I've been=
 066 =down to Argentina about three or four times because here=

067 =() our major problem is supply, especially leather supply.=
 068 =you know once we have leather.. here, to produce for you=
 069 we are positive that we're gonna increase.. uh.. production. (1.9)
 070 H how much business did we give.. give you in in eight=
 071 R [the reason]-
 072 H =months?... cause you really started producing around...
 073 R February.
 074 H no, wasn't February.. March.
 (acc)
 075 R March, probably... [] in March.
 076 H [] we're talking [] eight=
 077 =months.. March, April, May, May, June, July- eight=
 078 =months.. how much business... did we do with you (so=
 079 =far) in those eight months? (3.5) a million dollars?
 080 R close around that, I think.
 081 H I am telling you right now (1.2) that there's no question=
 082 =on my mind that next year we can build.. FOB... (at=
 083 =cost).. two and a half to three million dollars. (2.1)=
 084 =no question about it. (1.6)
 085 C (yeah, the goods are getting acceptance all over the place)
 086 H there's no question... the only question is is (2.0) ↑KI=
 087 =always get the feeling.. I'm here.. I go to see Mr Eli....
 088 C /he pulls out a paper/
 089 H he pulls that.
 090 R oh you see... none thing that uh I wanna show you.. =
 091 =tomorrow is the (kinds of) leather that we got from=

 092 =Keller, which we're not gonna- we can't use for you,
 093 H [yes,=
 094 =but you can ↑RETURN that to Keller? (2.0)
 095 R uh:: up to... well.. up to our trip to to to New York, ok, we=
 096 =were basically relying on Keller, [only on Keller]... so we=
 097 C [right. [right.
 098 R =had we had to keep a good relationship with him [otherwise,=
 099 C [right.
 100 R =you know, we'd be stuck with uh:: no other source,=
 101 =so that was the reason... for.. going down to Argentina=
 102 C [correct, correct.
 (acc)
 103 R =right? so many times.
 104 H absolutely.
 105 R uh: now.. that we're.. you know.... finally finalizing=
 106 =negotiations with Argentina, ... then we're gonna be in=
 107 =a different position even to negotiate with (Keller).
 108 H you'll be in a much stronger position.
 109 R [to-yeah: right.
 110 H but the point is I'm trying to make is that everytime we=
 111 =come here, I don't wanna feel.. like you said uh.. as=
 112 =soon as I walked in.. you said ↑oh, you make all the money,=
 113 =we don't. (5.0) [motorcycle passing by in the street]=
 114 =this is not (2.5) [this is not a comfortable feeling.
 115 R [you see, it has it has to do with=
 116 =the shock, ok?... because the situation a month ago.. =
 117 =was.. terrible but things are gonna change now, (Harry).
 118 H yeah, ↑but you must admit.. that.... I don't know if=
 119 =Altermann cooperates like we do, but we understood your=
 120 =problem we sat for a long time, I think we have done=

(dec)

- 121 =everything that.... a good marriage is required to do....
 122 =we've understood your problems, and we've helped. (1.6)
 123 R that's correct.
 124 H and.. we have to feel comfortable.... that when we price=
 125 =our goods, (1.5) that we're able to maintain that=
 126 =pricing for a year
 127 C we don't change.
 128 H we:: can't change
 129 C we never change, we are known... that=
 130 =we keep our pricing.
 131 H oh, the whole industry, nobody raises their price... I=
 132 =mean this is a this is a
 133 C not in the middle of the year.
 134 H /never, never/
 135 C because it gets locked in the catalogues.. and.. so many=
 136 =different things.
 137 R right.
 138 C that's the problem.
 139 H (look)... the whole philosophy.. of whether we buy from=
 140 =China, or whether we buy from Romenia, or any place else,=
 141 =(1.2) is that... we emphasize to them the only thing we=
 142 =have to give you is (volume), other than that we have=
 143 =nothing MORE to give you than the Europeans and... whatever=
 144 =country in the world ()... but we can give you=
 145 =commitments, and we are in a position to help you with your=
 146 =problems, which many.. other companies don't do, ok?=
 147 =that's the only thing we have to offer (2.0) when we deal=
 (dec)
 148 =with Mr Vramden- we are Mr Vramden's number one account... =
 149 =what he does for us he doesn't do for anybody else in the=
 150 =whole world... this I can tell you
 151 C he'll come over in five=
 152 =minutes notice and run all the way from NJ to our place.
 153 H If Mr Vramden says to=
 154 =me.. please don't buy these locks anymore.... I will ship=
 155 =you Trespo locks from my factory in Mexico, because I gotta=
 156 =support that factory in Mexico, that's it.. () go=
 157 =ahead and do it.... in other words, he knows he has one=
 158 =guy that he.. can always count on.... and that's important.
 159 R right.
 160 H public relations and and... relationship between buyer and=
 161 =seller is the most important thing in the world... and I=
 162 =think that ... what all of us have have accomplished... =
 163 =in one year is is.. incre dible.
 164 C phenomenon... it really is
 165 H could=
 166 =you believe? that .. that our competitors are selling our=
 167 =merchandise?... /this is the truth/... and they're saying we=
 168 =have a Carrar look... that's what our compe titors are=
 169 =saying.
 170 C yeah. they're using=
 171 =it as a general term, you know what I mean? (), right?
 172 H we have a Carrar=
 173 =look./
 174 R yeah.

175 H [and the buy-
 176 C [) the buyers know the name.
 177 H you know we we advertise in a very famous magazine CW,=
 178 [I showed you.
 179 R [I saw that.
 [dec]
 180 H we had we had three hundred and fifty phone calls....=
 181 =from consumers .. since that ad went into that magazine. =
 [dec]
 182 = (2.5) that's tremendous.... three hundred and fifty=
 183 =phone calls! (2.8) so we're doing a lot of marketing=
 184 =and a lot of advertising,
 185 R Harry, just one thing.... that /I think I should mention=
 186 =is that,/ you know that .. you're talking about two=
 187 =generations in this place,
 188 H I know all the politics.
 189 R so::..it's a matter of time [I understand, I understand,=
 190 H [absolutely. I understand, I understand,=
 191 =but I don't want to have to go through a meeting like we=
 192 =went through a month ago. (2.9) I mean, it was.. it was=
 193 =not a very comfortable (moment), (1.5)
 (pounds table once)
 194 R sure [was not.
 195 H [both for you and for us.
 196 R yeah, I know it. (1.6)
 197 H we have to build together (1.5) I think we we have the=
 198 =nucleus of a tremendous business. (7.0)
 199 R /yeah./ (4.5) /alright/ (1.5)
 200 H alright.. can we go back to the hotel?
 201 R SURE.
 202 H so I can unpack, (2.5) and:: (3.0)
 203 R so what's up for tonight? I mean, do you feel like going=
 204 =out for dinner?
 205 H of course... I'm not going to sleep... if I go to sleep=
 206 =now, I'll be up at twelve o'clock at night..
 207 R ok:
 (laughs)
 208 H Charlie will sleep in the restaurant.
 209 R (laughs)
 210 C don't worry. (2.0) no:: problem. (3.0)
 211 R ok,... so:: uh:: alright so I'll (meet you) tonight.. =
 212 =I'll get the car.
 213 H what about that crazy guy there?
 214 R yeah, I'm gonna call him up.
 215 H ↑ tell him we just flew in from NY he can come in and=
 216 =spend a few minutes with us.

S4 - OCT 19 - 9:17 a.m. - Eduardo's proposal to use cost sheets.

Roberto was out of the room.

They were ready to start talking about the first item in the new collection. The doubt was of whether they should talk about

modifications first, and then about the price, or the other way around. Eduardo proposed they discuss the price and then the modifications by using a detailed cost sheet.

001 C I think we ought to lower this.
 002 H I was just gonna say that, it's-
 003 C too high to get in here.
 004 H right.
 005 E [nods affirmatively]
 006 C you can't make it too much.
 007 H no, maybe uh
 008 C like uh
 009 E [signalling for floor with hands]
 010 H quarter of an inch.
 011 C yeah, I figured uh: uh one point five centimeters.
 012 H which is what? a quarter of an inch.
 013 C which uh (2.2) one point. . two five.
 014 H yeah.
 [looks at Eduardo over his glasses]
 015 E /a moment. /my suggestion is the following, we we'll work=
 016 =as we told in NY. . very clear. . in price. . we have to=
 017 =begin with the right price (1.9) today. . . . not to go to=
 018 =United States and, . . then, we'll see. . together . . the=
 019 =price, & I will give you one of this. and then we'll see=
 [shows sheets of paper]
 020 =some modification that we have to make (2.0) to: . . . to=
 021 =have a better price, understand?
 022 H [nods affirmatively]
 023 C oh.
 024 E I think that we seeing this, . . . we can see what we can make=
 025 =uh in: modifications, you know
 026 C [changes] yeah.
 027 H right.
 [nods affirmatively, moves chair upward; starts flipping notebook pages]
 028 E it's not good if you make changes now. . . and we. . .
 029 H right.
 030 E ok? I will give you one of this, this is. . my list. . I=
 031 C [alright]
 032 E =will see here. . this (1.2) cause if you begin uh to make=
 033 H [writing up notes; looking down]
 034 E =changes then (1.2) with here we-(1.4) I will take a copy=
 035 =of. . of each and we can see it together, (1.2) ok?
 036 H uh huh.
 037 E we have much time today, (5.5) ssixty 9. . 5. . 2 4?
 038 H no, sixty nine. . five. . three six.
 039 E five three six, ok, first we'll begin with this. . . . I=
 040 =will take one copy to you too, Charlie.
 041 C ok.

S8 - OCT 19 - around 9:50 a.m. - Brazilian party's point not made because of interruption. A new price was about to be given.

001 H now listen to this one.
 002 R now number one, (1.8) we could go for nylon instead of=
 003 =imitation.
 004 H [do me a favor.=
 005 =do me a favor, [give me.. the price.. then we will discuss=
 006 C [quote us the price.
 007 H =... your suggestions.. of how to reduce it.. but let's get=
 008 =the basic price. (1.4) that item is 6 9 5 9 5. (13.8) the=
 009 H =only one that may be workable is the big one.. 6 9 5 9 4.
 [facing Charles]
 010 C the tote?
 [facing Harry]
 011 H that's the only one that may be.. workable.
 012 C it's too high yet.
 [acc]
 013 H yeah, it's too high, but it's (2.8) it's possible. (3.2)
 014 C you can't put a nylon lining on it.
 015 R but there's no- it's unlined.
 016 C it's unlined, that's what I mean... there isn't anything=
 017 =they can stretch on it.
 018 H [it's true it's true () that zipper.
 019C that's right.

S15 - OCT 19 - around 5 p.m. - counter example of the American style of point making.

Harry made a point using background information prior to statement. The reason for this was that his point constituted an FTA.

001 E the big problem that we have is in the: 28?... no? (1.7) yes.
 002 H the 28 is totally
 [makes a face and nods negatively] [yes. 28 is=
 003 E
 004 =totally,-
 [hands on face] [acc]
 005 H I'm I'm telling you I don't care (1.4) what you're gonna=
 006 =tell me, you can't tell me.. that that item should be.. =
 007 =more than 30%... it's almost 40 %... higher.. you can't=
 008 =you can't convince me.. you can talk all day long about=
 009 =more leather, and more here, and more there;- (2.4)
 010 C nuh, something is wrong.
 011 H let me tell you something... and.. /you cn-/ I hope you=
 [hand in the air] [dec]
 012 =believe what I'm saying... but the Czechoslovakians are SO:.. =

013 =precise... ok? (2.9) and... there was no flexibility whatsoever=
014 =when they gave us the price... they said... [this is the price.
[pounds table]
[that's it.]
015 C
016 H [cause one thing- one thing about the Czechoslovakians=
017 C [they (walked) away.
018 H =because you try to learn... the culture of each country...=
019 =when you go to Romenia, you know you can... negotiate...=
020 =ok? when you go to Poland, you can negotiate. /not=
022 =Czechoslovakia... / they take the attitude, they must=
[acc]
023 =make a certain profit... /that's it. / (2.2) so when we=
024 =sat down and we talked about the prices, and you know=
025 =immediately I'm gonna say /well, you're a little high... /=
[hands and head moving]
026 =because that's that's what you're supposed to do... =
027 =they said Mr Kaplan, I'm telling you these are the=
028 =prices. (2.8) we're not saying accept it or leave, but these=
029 C [nods affirmatively and lip says 'yeah']
[acc]
030 =are the p- no flexibility. the only thing they said to me we=
031 =guarantee you one thing... whatever quantities you place and=
032 =whatever delivery dates we give you, you can be sure=
[slaps table]
[you'll get it=
033 C
034 C =on that date.
035 H =you'll get it, and checking with other people... that buy=
036 =from Czechoslovakia, Vramden brought us there, Mr=
037 C [yeah.
038 H =Vramden... (he says) whatever they tell you, you can believe=
[dec]
039 =one hundred per cent. out of all the Eastern bloc countries,=
040 C [yeah.
041 H =the Czechs... are the most honourable people of all of them. =
042 =/when they tell you something, you can believe it. /
[pounds table]
[we=
043 C
044 =heard that also from that other guy. ()
045 H [yeah, we met=
046 =a fellow from Malta.
047 C yeah.
048 H at the airport... he was buying textiles from uh::=
049 C [right.
050 H =Czechoslovakia. so the flight was delayed so we... we saw them=
051 C [said the same thing.
[acc]
052 H =and... we go over to them... and we say... do you speak=
053 =English? /yes. / (4.5) very nice fellows. and they also told=
054 =us the same thing. you can't negotiate with them, (4.2) but=
055 =when they tell you it's gonna be shipped... in three weeks,=
056 C =it's there.
[dec]
057 H [ONE HUNDRED per cent...
058 C yeah.
059 H it'll be three weeks. (2.4) so, (4.4) the point is the=
[eyebrows up] [puts glasses on]

060 =only reason in all honesty why we came here with these= (dec)

061 =samples.. is no matter how much they try to match... it=

062 =will never have the same exact feel... /it's impossible./=

063 =and we were told that by a number of tanneries... it'll=

064 =never be a hundred % the same.

065 C yeah, we want it to be a part of Carrar line

066 H ↑↑and what made=

067 =me very curious, (1.3) when I had the 1711... What was=

068 =made in.. Czechoslovakia.. we showed it to a few of our=

069 =customers... and we didn't tell them it was from=

070 =Czechoslovakia, /we wanted to test it/ (1.7) //you know, this=

071 =doesn't feel like the same().

072 C ↑right. yeah, it didn't have=

073 =the: [that convinced us.. that you can't make the same=

074 H =item in the two countries. /it's impossible./ when you make=

075 =(your) collection, it's gotta be all: from one country. (1.7)=

076 =and that's the only reason why we brought the samples=

077 =here, /but the pricing, you're not even close. (2.3) I mean=

078 =you're talking with the exception of one item or two items=

079 =15% difference.. the others are all over 20%.. makes no=

080 =sense. / (1.2) then ()

081 [that's (with) the Argentina /price/.

092 C then Eduardo is telling me we have to figure in between... =

093 H =cause you're gonna have to buy some Brazil and some=

094 =Argentinian.... which means that if you're quoting 55 94 and=

095 (looking at notes)

096 =53 dollars, we basically have to do about 54 dollars and change,

097 E yes the problem is [

098 H or thirty five dollars and change,=

099 =or forty four dollars and change.

(acc)

100 E if we travel there, and we we.. we make a contract.. by six=

101 =months if it's possible, ok... but I don't believe that we=

102 =can make a contract by six months.

103 H ↑but you can buy the quantities for six months [

104 E yeah, ok, I=

105 =will try, but I I.. we have to go now.

(shoulders arching and drooping)

106 H you can buy the quantities, forget about a contract for six=

107 E [no::

(stretching arms with hands behind neck)

108 H =months.. first you start negotiating the contract/.. but if=

109 =they say NO, ↑then you buy enough quantity.. for the six=

110 =months.. [right.

111 C

112 H you know we're gonna give you the quantity.. to cover yourself=

113 =for six months, that's not hard, [when we project,

114 C I could do=

115 H

116 =that. [he keeps up to his projections.

117

118 H I have not violated one agreemnet that I've made.. but guys,=

119 =come on /I mean/ (1.7) and believe me I did not low-ball you=

120 =on these prices... these are the true prices.... in fact=

121 =these prices in reality.. even if you met these prices,=
 122 =Czechoslovakia would still be cheaper, because the ocean=
 123 C [freight.
 124 H = [freight is cheaper.... But it's worth it to me..to have=
 125 =the whole collection made in one place:... rather than /to=
 126 =make some here /and some there..// and ↑I'm going to give=
 127 =them business,.. but it's going to be in a different,...
 128 C different line.
 129 H [different line... cause I don't wanna give up=
 130 =their.. their ability to make nice merchandise.. /and=
 131 =they make nice merchandise./
 132 C yeah, even your people said ()
 133 H [you said yourself.. (that they=
 134 =did a nice job.) [yeah, at=
 135 R [yeah, at=
 136 =least the samples look great,yeah.
 137 H they're terrific.... so we don't wanna give up that..=
 138 =that:uh
 139 C [that source, yeah:
 140 H [that contact.
 (cigarrette in mouth)
 141 C yep.
 142 H (that's why we're going) right after here we're going to=
 143 =Czechoslovakia. (we're going) (9.0) there has to be something=
 144 =wrong in the calculations.. has to be (1.5) you can't=
 145 ~~=tell me that the flap case (1.7) fifty two oh five...=~~
 147 =58 50 (1.8) there's no way.
 148 E the difference between Argentina and Brazil?
 149 H no, no, no.
 150 E or you're speaking about the difference?
 151 C [no, no. he's talking about the: price, that ()
 152 H [if you- [our price is=
 153 =43 dollars and 50 cents.
 154 E yes.
 155 H ok?, and you're quoting me 52 05.. and 58 50.. so if you take=
 156 =the 52 oh five, we're roughly about (1.8) 18% difference.
 157 R [to someone who comes in] [deu pro Luizinho? obrigado.
 158 E fif- uh fourteen per cent.
 159 H no.
 160 E yes... 52.. 05 t- (1.8) forty five,
 161 H [45 50 (3.2) it's more than 14%.

S16 - OCT 19 - around 5:30 p.m. - scattered support for a point
 not completed by the Brazilian part. This was the continuation of
 a long debate comparing Brazil and Czechoslovakia.

Here Roberto was trying to gather background information from
 Harry and Charles in order to make a point saying that the Czechs
 had to have some advantage over Courofatos, or they wouldn't have

been able to quote the prices that Harry said they did. Eduardo presented the reasons for the high price of the items again, but they were not perceived as a point.

001 H all the cases are roughly fif-fourteen 15 % difference.
 002 C ()
 003 H every single item is
 004 E and also the: the ()
 005 H with the exception=
 006 =of of.. your your uh:
 007 E the leather that we are calculation there is very very=
 008 H your 6 9 5 2 8.
 009 E =cheap. (1.7) we never had.. in: our story.. a price in=
 010 =leather as we are making now... SURE (2.9) you know, one=
 (shoulders up and down)
 011 H (raises eyebrows quickly; glass off)
 (dec)
 012 =point.. sssixty four.. plus 20% of waste (4.1) /twenty=
 013 =per cent of waste./ this iss-(2.9) and then we can speak=
 014 =about another material but uh.. we saw that the material=
 015 =is not uh.. the difference is not too:
 016 H /we have no future. / (3.8)

(acc)

017 E and about the the.. the labor, we have here, we are=
 018 =putting here, ten per cent of the total value... the:=
 019 =() value is our... labor... 10 % only. (5.8)
 020 R it's really amazing how the Czechs.. can.. can.. sell at=
 021 =such a price, (2.9) I mean, if their-if they have to buy=
 022 E if they have the=
 023 R =leather, which they have to buy leather,
 024 E =leather.
 025 H //no, they have their=
 026 =own tannery.//
 027 E he said=
 028 =that) that that they (don't) export leather, (then)
 029 H they-
 030 C no, they have their own tannery right there
 031 H they=
 032 =will not export leather.
 033 E they have ()
 034 H they have their own tannery.
 035 C their own tannery, right.. next to=
 036 H right=
 037 C =the factory.
 038 H =next to the factory. (1.7)
 039 C so they're not making a profit. they're probably..=
 040 R so maybe- the factory is:
 041 C =just interlocking.
 042 H whatever the reason is, I can't=
 043 =turn my backs on them.. they're a very good source.
 044 R no, sure. yeah, but maybe the explanation for these prices=
 045 =from Czechs is this. is that they're not, they're not=
 046 H yeah but- but-

[dec]

047 R =their tannery is not charging them... a market price.
 048 H [yeah but remember,
 049 H (they're an) international.. country now... it's not where=
 050 =they were.. they were a closed country, now they're an open=
 051 =society. (1.8) And yet they're still quoting these prices.
 052 C you know this is 36 point 97... per cent difference?
 053 H which one?

S32 - OCT 20 - 8:15 a.m. - This segment shows the point about the right price of the 69528 as a result of Charles request for clarification.

001 C there's even another point here... In here, you have=
 [standing, facing Harry] [facing E] [hand inside 1719]
 002 =vinyl lining.. Where. right? your PU lining there. over=
 003 =here, you have two pieces of PU,=
 [1719 gusset]
 004 H =you don't have that much more PU in this case.]
 [69528]]
 005 C]
 006] =↑↑you=
 =have_LESS.

 007 H that's right.
 008 C =you have less, So then if you took.. these leather=
 009 =gussesst off,.. and put- =made them of PU, it would like..=
 010 =equal.. wah: this piece here. right? one side.
 [inside 1719]
 011 H there's no (leather).
 [rests head on table]
 012 C [even with the (lux).
 013 E Charlie, while.. we make two of this, we make one=
 [points with pen to 1719]
 014 =of this.. in the production.
 [69528]
 015 C yeah,
 016 E do you accept?
 017 C no.
 018 E (I) accept.
 019 C [no: I-
 020 E [no, you see that.. has uh too much labor. (3.2) here.. this,
 [stands up and moves over to where 69528 is]
 021 C I see [there's more here.]
 022 E [here, [stitching,
 023 C yeah.
 024 E here, (4.9)
 025 C but once this thing is cut, ok? and once it's put=
 026 =together with the tapes,.. before they stitch it.. (1.6)=
 027 =I mean::uh:
 028 E [yeah, and then?)
 029 C it: goes through.... is this a double needle or a single?
 030 E single.

031 C single needle. you don't have double [needle machines like=
032 E [no.
[mode negatively many times]

033 C =that? (1. 6) why?
034 E to make the same time? the the the: (both)?
[shows stitching on 69528]

035 C yeah.
036 E no, (one time).
037 H why not?
[stitching back in his seat]
[dec]

038 C that's such a simple machine.
039 E [but normally we don't make this=
[moving towards his seat] [shows stitching on 69528]

040 =kind... of of of work.
041 C you don't do any double stitching?
[index and thumb touching; hand in the air]
042 E yeah, but... together.
[shows it on case]

043 C yeah, but those machines are: adjustable, no?
044 E [mode negatively]
045 C the ones you have are not adjustable. (10.5)
[index and thumb moving back and forth showing different widths]

046 H /so use a single stitch in this item.../ //what's the=
[yawns]

047 =big deal...// /like the 9 0 7, Charlie.../

048 C yeah... yeah.
049 H /could use a single stitch./ (1.2)
050 C or don't use any stitch. (1.2)
[index covering mouth in 'thinking' position]
[acc]

051 H /then they have to use a full panel./
052 C yeah.
053 H well, it makes no difference, bcause they're saying that=
054 =they're not saving any money by [adding two pieces]
055 C [that's what I'm saying.=
056 =because they're telling us the labor of putting this together=
[dec] [touches 69528]

057 =is equaling the difference in the single [line].
058 H [alright,=
059 =so use one full panel.
060 C [use then a full panel.. would that be=
[facings Eduardo]

061 =easier?... cheaper?... less labor? (8.1)
062 R (it's a kind of... stitching. (2.1)
[gets up from seat to get a case]

063 C you wanna use two panels? stitch it together, like the=
064 =back of the: uh: thing. here.
[moves over to pick up writing portfolio]

065 H like the 9 0 7, Charlie.
066 C well, this is.. like the 9 0 7.
[shows writing portfolio]

067 H yeah.
068 C do this... then you have two panels...
069 R /ok./ (2.8)
070 C then you don't have the alignment problems.

071 E I know. (2.1)
 072 C got it on both sides. (7.8) but it it- (11.0) I I,=
 (coughs) (looking at 69528)
 (acc)
 073 =honestly, I.. ve wanna WORK with you.... this Carrar program=
 (moving back to his seat)
 074 =can be huge. gah- I mean,... it can be great for everybody.=
 075 E =ve also want to: work with you, but I.. what I cannot=
 076 =ac- accept is that you give me.. five per cent MORE on this=
 077 =one.. than you are uh you're paying today to us.. in this..=
 078 =this st- style. (you) don't believe, this.. has.. too much=
 079 =material.. that this has.. also the labor is twice.. this=
 080 =(1.2) yes, ↑SURE. I'm.. I know I know that.. in production..=
 081 =this... will be.. this is what uh uh ve talked with=
 082 =the people here.... ve shoved to the people here what do=
 083 =you think about this (here)
 084 C ↑so how much is the labor?
 085 E no, no it's not about only of the- how much is the labor. if=
 086 =I make, for example, 200 thousand dollars in one section,=
 087 =I'm- I will do only.. 100.. thousand.. US dollars.. all the=
 (points to 69528)
 088 =things, labor, everything.. ve ve have to uh:.. ratear?
 089 C you're pro-rating over the whole line?
 090 E ratear?
 (facing Roberto)
 091 C uh?
 092 R ratio.
 093 E o que eu quero dizer e

[conversation breaks into two floors for 17"]

094 C yeah, but what he's saying is that uh he's got a higher=
 095 =unit, (1.5) if he makes 200 thousand dollars worth of=
 096 =this, he can only make say 150 thousand of this.
 097 R [and ve gotta pay the same:
 098 C [and he's making up the (the.. difference.. WITH US] (with)=
 099 E ,
 100 =the same cost.
 101 H () getting more money for that. /
 102 C I understand that, and uh:
 103 E no, not more money, but- (2.5)
 104 H the- there's a difference in philosophy.

REFERENCES

- Agar, Michael H. 1980. *The professional stranger*. New York: Academic Press.
- Aristotle. *Rhetorica*. translated by W. Rhys Roberts. *The works of Aristotle*, vol XI, ed. by W. D. Ross, 1354^a-1420^b. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interactions*, ed. by Esther Goody, 56-289. Cambridge: University Press.
- Byrnes, Heidi. 1986. Interational style in German and American conversations. *Text* 6-2. 189-205.
-
- Citelli, Adilson. 1988. *Linguagem e persuasão*. São Paulo: Ática.
- Coulthard, R. Malcolm. 1985. *Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Dore, John., and Ray P. McDermott. 1982. Linguistic indeterminacy and social context in utterance interpretation. *Language* 58. 374-98.
- Eco, Umberto. 1989. *Como se faz uma tese*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Ellis, Rod., and Celia Roberts. 1987. Two approaches for investigating SLA in context. *SLA in context*, ed. by Rod Ellis, 3-29. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Erickson, Frederick. 1988. Ethnographic description. *Sociolinguistics*, vol. 2, ed. by Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar and Klaus J. Mattheir, 1081-1095. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

- . 1991. *Ethnographic microanalysis of interaction*. Philadelphia: mimeo.
- , and Jeffrey Shultz. 1977. When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. *Ethnography and language*, ed. by J.L. Green and Cynthia Wallat, 147-60. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.
- , and Wilson Jan. 1982. Sights and sounds of life in schools: A resource guide to film and videotape for research and education. *Research Series* 125. 39-51. Institute for Research on Teaching of the College of Education at Michigan State University.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. *Directions in sociolinguistics*, ed. by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 213-50. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fairclough, Norman L. 1988. *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fischer, Roger. & William Ury. 1983. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
- Francis, David W. 1986. Some structures of negotiation talk. *Language in Society* 15. 53-80.
- Giglioli, Pier Paolo. 1972. *Language and social context*. Baltimore, Md.:Penguin.
- Goffman, Erving. 1972. The neglected situation. In Giglioli, 61-6.
- . 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- . 1981. Footing. In his *Forms of talk*, 124-57. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982a. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, University Press.

- . 1982b (ed). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge, University Press.
- , and Jenny Cook-Gumperz. 1982a. Introduction: language and the communication of social identity. In Gumperz 1982b, 1-21.
- , and Jenny Cook-Gumperz. 1982b. Interethnic communication in committee negotiations. In Gumperz 1982b, 145-62.
- ; Gurinder Aulakh; and Hannah Kaltman. 1982. Thematic structure and progression in discourse. In Gumperz 1982b, 22-56.
- Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 1986. Arguments with Khomeini: Rhetorical situation and persuasive style in cross-cultural perspective. *Text* 6-2. 171-87.
-
- Kochman, Thomas. 1986. Strategic ambiguity in black speech genres: Cross-cultural interference in participant observation research. *Text* 6-2. 153-70.
- Kress, Gunther. 1985. *Linguistic processes in socio-cultural practice*. Burwood, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Mishra, Arpita. 1982. Discovering connections. In Gumperz 1982b, 57-71.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Transcription as theory. *Developmental pragmatics*, ed. by Elinor Ochs and Bambi B. Schieffelin. New York: Academic Press.
- Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language transfer*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Piazza, Roberta. 1987. Conversational analysis: a Review of the literature from the perspective of sequencing. *IRAL* XXV. 317-335.

Phillips, Susan U. 1972. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. *Functions of language in the classroom*, ed. by Courtney B. Cazden, Dell Hymes and Vera P. John, 370-94. New York: Teachers College Press.

Poole, Marshall Scott. 1985. Tasks and interaction sequences: a theory of coherence in group decision-making interaction. In Street and Cappella, 206-24.

Preston, Dennis. 1985. The Li'l Abner syndrome: Written representations of speech. *American Speech* 60. 328-336.

---. 1989. Interactional factors. In his *Sociolinguistics and SLA*, 122-93. Oxford : Basil Blackwell.

Putnam, Linda. 1985. Bargaining as task and process: multitude functions of interaction sequences. In ~~Street and Cappella,~~ 225-42.

Rampton, Ben. Stylistic variability and not speaking 'normal' English: Some post-Labovian approaches and their implications for the study of interlanguage. *SLA in context*, ed. by Rod Ellis, 47-58. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Richards, Jack C. 1981. Talking across cultures. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 37. 572-582.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1982. *The ethnography of communication*. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press.

Sgarbieri, Astrid N. 1990. Marcas linguísticas de assimetria em interações diádicas transculturais. Paper presented at the IX Conference of Latin American Linguistics and Philology Association.

- Shultz, Jeffrey., Susan Florio, and Frederick Erickson. 1982. Where's the floor? *Ethnography and education: Children in and out of school*, ed. by Perry Gilmore & Alan Glatthorn, 88-123. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Skehan, P. 1989. *Individual differences in second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Street, Richard L., and Joseph Cappella. 1985. *Sequence and pattern in communicative behaviour*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1979. What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. *New dimentions in discourse processes*, ed. by Roy Freedle, 137-181. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- . 1981a. Indirectness in discourse: ethnicity as conversational style. *Discourse Processes* 4. 221-38.
-
- . 1981b. New York Jewish conversational style. ~~*International Journal of the Sociology of Language*~~ 30. 133-49.
- . 1984a. *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- . 1984b. The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics* 5. 189-195.
- . 1984c. Cross-cultural communication. *CATESOL occasional papers* 10. 1-16.
- . 1986a. *That's not what I meant!: How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. New York: William Morrow, Ballantine.
- . 1986b (ed.) *Discourse in cross-cultural communication*, special edition of *Text* 6-2.
- . 1987. Repetition in conversation. *Language* 63. 574-605.

- . 1989. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: University Press.
- , and Cynthia Wallat. 1987. Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50. 205-216.
- Teruchkin, Sonia Unikowsky. 1990. RS: Mudanças no perfil exportador. *A economia gaúcha e os anos 80*, vol. 3, ed. by Pedro Fernando Cunha de Almeida, 595-645. Porto Alegre: Fundação de Economia e Estatística.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4. 91-112.
- Volkema, Roger J. 1988. The mediator as face manager. *Mediation Quarterly* 22. 5-14.
-
- Wiemann, John M. 1985. ~~Interpersonal control and regulation in~~ conversation. In Street and Cappella, 85-102.
- Wolfson, Nessa. 1989. *Perspectives in sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury House.